

still to be fulfilled. Help us to succeed in given this day by Cardinal Terence J. Cooke.

Cardinal COOKE. Heavenly Father, loving God of our Fathers, on this Inauguration Day we thank You for all the blessings You have bestowed upon our Nation and our people. We thank You for the vast resources of our land, the lofty hopes and ideals of our citizens, the devotion and dedication of those who bear the responsibility of public service.

Heavenly Father, as we approach the second centenary of our freedom and independence, our gratitude for the past carries with it an earnest prayer for the future. We have yet so much to accomplish! There are even now so many of Your blessings not yet adequately shared,

the great and continuing task of assuring a fuller life, true liberty, real peace, and perfect human dignity for all.

Heavenly Father, our Nation's motto proclaims that we trust in You. Help us to realize the full meaning of this trust. Deepen our awareness that without You, even our best effort is as nothing; without Your help, we simply cannot achieve our hopes and our ideals.

Heavenly Father, bless our President and our Vice President who today dedicate themselves to 4 years of service to all the people of this Nation. Give them standing, patience and courage.

Heavenly Father, our Nation yearns for peace. Help us to achieve true peace at home and abroad and to be an example of so many of our hopes and aspirations

a peace-loving, peace-making people to the nations of the world. We are pledged to be "one Nation under God." Bless every effort of our leaders to make us one and keep all of us, Heavenly Father, under the protection of Your abiding and never-failing love. Amen.

Senator COOK. Fellow Americans, the inauguration of our President is more than a traditional ceremony. It is an opportunity to recommit our Nation to the ideals of liberty and peace upon which it was founded.

With this thought in mind, we will now be favored by Miss Ethel Ennis, who will sing "The Star-Spangled Banner". (Miss Ennis sang the national anthem, audience standing.)

(The inaugural ceremonies were concluded at 12:26 p.m.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REVENUE SHARING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, a recent edition of the Greensburg, Pa., Tribune-Review included an interesting editorial concerning the revenue-sharing program.

The editorial points out that according to figures compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the cities and States of this Nation had a tax surplus—surplus—of \$14.8 billion during the second quarter of 1972. By contrast, the Federal Government ran a deficit of \$28.9 billion in the Federal funds for the fiscal year which ended last June 30.

For the 4-year period ending June 30, the accumulated Federal funds deficit will exceed \$100 billion.

Certain large cities are in bad financial condition, as the editorial notes, but the overall condition of our States and municipalities are nowhere near as bad as is the financial condition of the Federal Government.

So long as the Federal Government runs huge deficits, there really is no revenue to be shared with the States and localities. We can only increase the deficit and share the debt.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Poverty Suit," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, and that this editorial be followed by a table I have prepared showing deficits in Federal funds and interest on the national debt.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review, Dec. 14, 1972]

POVERTY SUIT

During the congressional debate over revenue-sharing earlier this year, proponents claimed that the cities and states were des-

titute and needed a handout from Uncle Sam. Opponents, such as Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Ind.-Va., responded that Washington had no money to share and was itself around \$400 billion in debt.

Now it turns out that the revenue-sharing propaganda about bankruptcy of local and state government was no more than political rhetoric. The U.S. Department of Commerce reports that cities and states ran up a \$14.8 billion tax surplus during the second quarter of 1972. Even so cities and states are presently receiving \$2.85 million in revenue-sharing. During the next five years, federal revenue-sharing will total almost \$30 billion. Congress hasn't bothered to figure out how to pay for the grants so it is possible that the \$30 billion will be added on to the national debt.

Just three states alone, California, New York and Florida, are expected to end up with at least \$1 billion in surplus during fiscal year 1973 which goes through next June 30. Florida has already collected \$300 million over expenditures this year.

Free market economists would rejoice if the federal government could collect a few billion dollars more than it spent in an entire year, let alone a single quarter. They would, in fact, happily settle simply for a balance in taxes and expenditures. Sadly, however, Washington might go another \$30 billion in the hole this fiscal year, for a \$100 billion deficit in just the last three years.

State-local affluence has been reflected in the sale of tax-exempt government bonds. Interest on high-grade 20-year bonds has dropped from 5.5 to less than 5 per cent this year because of increased market demands. Falling interest rates are a sign of rising financial prosperity for the sellers.

Naturally enough, not all cities are in good financial shape. Some of the larger Eastern municipalities are debt-ridden or bankrupt. New York City is probably the most notorious example. Mayor John Lindsay has increased the city's spending from \$3 billion a year to \$8 billion and he still can't balance the budget. Like many other liberal mayors, Lindsay has turned his city into a paradise for loafers, encouraging people to move into New York, stop working and get on the relief rolls which have at least doubled under this administration.

Granted that there are a few poverty pockets around the country, the revenue-sharers were still wrong about a local-state financial crisis. On the contrary, however, Uncle Sam doesn't have just a few poverty pockets he

wears an entire suit of destitution. He is, in fact, the poorest cousin of them all.

DEFICITS IN FEDERAL FUNDS AND INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT, 1954-73 INCLUSIVE

[Billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	Debt Interest
1954	62.8	65.9	-3.1	6.4
1955	58.1	62.3	-4.2	6.4
1956	65.4	63.8	+1.6	6.8
1957	68.8	67.1	+1.7	7.2
1958	66.6	69.7	-3.1	7.6
1959	65.8	77.0	-11.2	7.6
1960	75.7	74.9	+.8	9.2
1961	75.2	79.3	-4.1	9.0
1962	79.7	86.6	-6.9	9.1
1963	83.6	90.1	-6.5	9.9
1964	87.2	95.8	-8.6	10.7
1965	90.9	94.8	-3.9	11.4
1966	101.4	106.5	-5.1	12.0
1967	111.8	126.8	-15.0	13.4
1968	114.7	143.1	-28.4	14.6
1969	143.3	148.8	-5.5	16.6
1970	143.2	156.3	-13.1	19.3
1971	133.7	163.7	-30.0	20.8
1972	148.8	177.7	-28.9	21.2
1973 ¹	155.6	188.0	-32.4	22.3
20-year total	1,932.3	2,138.2	-205.9	241.5

¹ Estimated figures.

Source: Office of Management and Budget and Treasury Department.

TED F. MERRILL: MAN OF GOLDEN DEEDS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, history should not be mute to those among us who have given freely of themselves in order to encourage others toward achieving a worthwhile purpose in their lives.

Shakespeare said of Othello, "He hath a daily beauty in his life." Such a description can well apply to Ted F. Merrill who, on January 25, will be justly

honored by the Morningside Park Lions Club with their man-of-the-year award.

A native of Dayton, Ohio, born in 1904, Ted Merrill was only 12 years old when he was left orphaned. At this tender age, forced to think for himself, he began to forge the strength of character that would serve as an inspiration to the youth of the next generation.

Realizing early the value of education, he worked long nights and weekends to accomplish his own. At the age of 16 he began his apprenticeship in the construction industry as a swamper on a truck.

Ted Merrill is a classic example of a self-made man, for through his own hard work he elevated himself to becoming an owner of his own construction business, going on to become a certified general contractor.

But doing for himself left an unfulfilled desire in Ted Merrill's life. Knowing that other young men would be faced with adversity that would block their own achievement, he became the guiding light to young students in need of a helping hand. His was their strength as he helped many young people secure their education, and he was to know a deep satisfaction when one such protege became a lawyer, another a certified public accountant, another a fine surgeon, and another a teacher. One became a missionary to in turn help others as Ted Merrill had helped him.

Still others are completing their education now, achievements which would not be possible without the direct help and encouragement of Ted Merrill. Numerous high school and college students each year are given other opportunities to help themselves through vacation employment provided by this man's construction firm.

By presenting Ted Merrill with an honorary life membership in the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, the PTA recognized his great contribution to carrying out its programs and activities. He has supplied props and equipment, transportation and manpower countless times; and, when a helping hand is needed, the PTA turns to this man who is certain to heed its call.

In 1953 Ted Merrill was appointed to fill a vacancy on the board of Inglewood City Schools. Since that time he has been honored with reelection three times. He served as vice-president of the board for the term 1956-57. As president of the board in 1958-59, he was instrumental in the successful passing of a school bond issue of more than \$3 million. He again served as vice president of the board for the 1962-63 term, and as president of the board in 1963-64.

During his 18 years of service to the school board, many were the occasions when he drew upon his knowledge and ability—without personal financial gain—to save the district thousands of dollars in building. He helped the district obtain an enormous amount of supplies, equipment, and funds that would not otherwise be forthcoming.

In 1955 Ted Merrill was honored by then-Governor Knight with an appointment to serve as one of California's two delegates to the White House Conference on Education.

His awareness of the important human element, coupled with his dedication to encouraging all citizens to make the most of their educational opportunities, he initiated a program of awarding diplomas to the graduating class in adult education. Each year he has been invited to continue this personal presentation of achievement recognition.

To further encourage students to attain excellence, and to imbue them with a desire to do their best in all they undertake, each year Ted Merrill personally donates and presents trophies to outstanding athletes of high school teams. And each year he purchases a series of tickets for the Shrine North-South High School all-star football game to be given to members of high school football teams.

Among his other activities are life membership in the Al Malaikah Temple and the Shriner's Crippled Children's Hospital as well as long-term membership in Elks Lodge 1492. Somehow in his activity-filled life he has found the time to author and publish a reference book for insurance adjusters which has been reprinted three times. And he has been a devoted husband to his wife of more than 30 years and raised five children of his own, three boys and two girls.

Rarely does one see a more distinguished record of service and devotion to the welfare of his community than that of Ted F. Merrill. He is most worthy of all honors accorded him in appreciation of his many golden deeds.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UNITED LATVIAN ASSOCIATIONS OF CHICAGO

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the commemoration ceremonies of the 54th Independence Day of Latvia a resolution was adopted by the United Latvian Associations of Chicago.

I heartily concur with this resolution and would like to offer its contents for your consideration. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Latvian people have a God-given right to exist as a people, to enjoy and exercise these rights accepted as basic by all the people of the Western world, to control their own destinies and to rule the land they have inhabited for thousands of years unmolested by any occupying force, and

Whereas they have a right to build a better and more secure future for coming generations of Latvians, thereby also contributing to the ethic of justice and peace and stability in the world community, and

Whereas the Soviet Russian Government continues to deny the Latvian people these rights,

Now therefore be it resolved by the United Latvian Associations of Chicago to request President Nixon, in the name of justice and all Latvian-American citizens of the United States to do all in his power to bring to a halt the Soviet Government's policy of Russification in Latvia and the other Baltic States.

Be it further resolved, that we request President Nixon to implement resolution number 416.

Be it further resolved, that President Nixon and the United States Government actively seek at the forthcoming European Security Conference to bring about the restoration of independence for Latvia and the other Baltic States and that the United States Government make the restoration of independence for the Baltic States a precondition for a large scale European settlement.

Be it further resolved, that we actively inform the American and other people of our goals and aspirations and seek their support in achieving them.

Be it further resolved that we request President Nixon and Congress to appropriate funds for the implementation of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act in the January supplementary budget.

ONE WORLD SOCIALIST SUMMIT MEETING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist International Conference met in Paris on January 13 and 14, and was attended by the Socialist Party representatives of 18 countries, including five heads of government; that is, Golda Meir of Israel; Kreisky, Austria; Jorgensen, Denmark; Sorsa, Finland; and Palme of Sweden.

While President Pompidou of France, leader of the host nation, criticized the conference as "an intrusion in French internal politics." In fact, he absented himself from France to visit Moscow at the time of the meeting—the entire timing and purpose of the world socialist meeting was anti-American and signaled the beginning of demonstrations in the United States and abroad to interfere in the Presidential inauguration in the United States.

Anti-free world demonstrations followed in every Socialist and Communist country and in the United States. In Washington the demonstrations are being coordinated by the National Peace Action Coalition—NPAC—a tightly disciplined group manipulated by Trotskyist cadres of the Socialist Workers Party, and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice—PCPJ—a less disciplined coalition of free wheeling radicals and unaligned Socialist and Communist groups.

The International Socialist denies Communist membership and affiliation, yet none of this world meeting of Socialists had activities related to any war other than that in Vietnam nor to any other claim of exploitation of human rights and denial of peace and justice without a free world nation being the target. The sounds of the shrill voices and marching feet echo other national socialists on a world empire building rampage. Is the Socialist Internationale sung to the tune of the Communist Internationale?

Winston Churchill's definition of socialism is appropriate—

Socialism is the philosophy of failure, the credo of ignorance, and the creed of envy.

I include a list of the 18 countries represented at the Socialist International meeting in Paris, from the newspaper *Le Monde*, dated January 16, 1973, and related newscippings:

[From *Le Monde*, Paris, France, Jan. 16, 1973]

Countries whose Socialist parties sent delegates to the Socialist International meeting in Paris:

Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Holland, Ireland, Israel.

Italy (2 socialist parties), Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, West Germany.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1973]

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL HITS U.S. STANCE
(By Jonathan C. Randal)

PARIS, January 14.—The Socialist International ended a two-day conference here today by "deploring and regretting" last month's American bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, but it stopped short of a wholesale condemnation of the United States in light of improved peace prospects.

Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir, Austrian Premier Bruno Kreisky and James Callaghan of the British Labor Party were credited with watering down criticism of the United States at the meeting of world socialist leaders representing 19 nations and with preventing a formal resolution.

They were reported to have moderated the outspokenly anti-American sentiments of Swedish Premier Olof Palme, other Scandinavian leaders and the meeting's host Francois Mitterrand.

Even Palme was obliged to note after a meeting with Hanoi negotiator Xuan Thuy that Henry A. Kissinger's description of the just-concluded round of secret talks as "useful" was "not in contradiction" with the news from the North Vietnamese peace negotiator.

Such was the inconclusive nature of the Socialist meeting held at the French Senate that it would have passed virtually unnoticed had it not been for President Georges Pompidou's violent criticism at his semiannual news conference last week.

Pompidou charged that Mitterrand had purposely invited his fellow Socialists to Paris in the midst of the French general election campaign. He termed their presence here "untimely" and "an intrusion in French internal politics" and refused official contact with them because they were here in their capacities as Socialist party members.

Although he carefully avoided naming names, his remarks were widely interpreted as criticism of Mrs. Meir's presence. Franco-Israeli relations have never recovered from the pro-Arab slant ordered by the late President Charles de Gaulle after the Six-Day War in 1967.

There are as many as 300,000 Jewish voters—and many more pro-Israeli sympathizers—in France, and their ballots could make the difference in the March elections. Many seats may be decided by a few hundred votes or fewer.

Even if the French government sent no official representatives to greet or meet the Socialist heads of governments, the Paris police was out in the thousands to protect them. Nonetheless, yesterday hundreds of pro-Palestinian Frenchmen demonstrated in Paris and Marseilles.

In fact, Mrs. Meir appears to have stolen the thunder from both host Mitterrand and the French government by leaving Paris this afternoon for a potentially more meaningful visit to Rome. Monday, she is scheduled to become the first Israeli prime minister to meet the Pope officially.

The Socialist leaders also decided to send missions to Southeast Asia, Peking and Moscow—but curiously not to Washington—to,

in Callaghan's words "look, listen and learn if there is any way in which the Socialist International can help put a stop to the war."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1973]

PROTESTS ON WAR READIED—LEADERS HOPE FOR 50,000 AT INAUGURAL

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Antiwar organizers, divided on tactics and targets but united on the general concept of mass street action, are working day and night to bring thousands of dissidents here to protest at President Nixon's second inauguration Saturday.

Most plan to come in peace, a few avowedly to disrupt—but come they will, say organizers.

Despite new indications over the weekend of headway toward a Vietnam cease-fire at the Paris peace talks, antiwar leaders say they are moving full steam ahead with their plans.

Grass roots response so far is greater than at any time since the mass marches of 1970 and early 1971, say the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ), coplanners of a solemn "March Against Death" on Constitution Avenue NW, the major "counter-inaugural" event set for Saturday.

Inquiries about housing, transportation and other logistics are pouring into NPAC and PCPJ from much of the Eastern part of the nation, and they have boosted their official estimate of the possible maximum number of demonstrators to 50,000.

Separately in a contrast to the NPAC-PCPJ scenario, leaders of the militant Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the nominally anarchist Youth International Party (YIP) say they hope to draw 1,000 to 2,000 hard-core protesters to march near the Capitol where some will try to disrupt the inaugural parade and confront police on Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

The Saturday actions thus will test anew the strength of the multifaceted antiwar movement, largely dormant in recent months.

Riding what they say is a new tide of antiwar frustration and anger, organizers hope to draw a broad cross section of Americans ranging from students, counterculture advocates and other traditional demonstrators to housewives, armchair liberals and others new to the street.

"There's a certain element of real spontaneity developing," says Sidney Peck, PCPJ national coordinator and longtime antiwar activist. "... People are getting beyond the sense of immobility and dumbfoundedness they felt at the time of the bombing escalation" last month, he said.

Rumors of an imminent cease-fire accord will not dampen antiwar response or cut attendance at the mass march and rally, says NPAC coordinator Jerry Gordon.

"People were burned before" by Nixon adviser Henry Kissinger's "peace is at hand" prophecy last Oct. 26, he said yesterday, and "the memory of the Christmas season slaughter of the Vietnamese has not been erased. The skepticism about new peace rumors runs too deep."

Even if a cease-fire is signed by Saturday, Gordon said, "we will protest the continuing U.S. military presence in Thailand and Southeast Asian waters—factors not covered by the cease-fire."

Saturday's actions will mark the second time that President Nixon has been confronted with a "counterinaugural" presence. In January, 1969, more than 6,000 dissidents participated in a raucous counterinaugural "ball" and parade down Pennsylvania Avenue. A breakaway group of about 1,000 also stoned the presidential limousine, clashed with police and vandalized portions of downtown Washington.

Most organizing activity for the upcoming

inauguration surrounds three separate demonstration plans:

A noon mass march from the Lincoln Memorial down Constitution Avenue to a 1:30 p.m. rally on the Washington Monument grounds, sponsored jointly by NPAC and PCPJ.

A smaller march at 11 a.m. by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) from Arlington Cemetery across Memorial Bridge to a symbolic peace treaty-signing ceremony at the D.C. War Memorial in West Potomac Park near the Reflecting Pool.

A 10:30 a.m. march from 8th and H Streets NE to a rally at Union Station Plaza near the Capitol led by SDS and its affiliated Progressive Labor Party (PLP).

YIP "spokespersons" say they will join the SDS-PLP march and later attempt to disrupt some unspecified portion of the inaugural parade on Pennsylvania Avenue. "We want to create as much chaos as possible," explained a YIPster who identified himself as "Attila the Hun" at a recent YIP press conference.

SDS spokesman Cleve Farmer said SDS-PLP activists may also conduct some unspecified form of "civil disobedience."

Police are silent about their preparations. NPAC and PCPJ have gone to great lengths to disassociate themselves from any planned confrontations, noting that their demonstration area is separate from the militants' and also remote from the official inaugural route.

They are also training march marshals for crowd control, another standard procedure the two coalitions have used in the past. The last major antiwar demonstration here occurred on April 24, 1971, when an estimated 175,000 protesters rallied peacefully at the Capitol.

In addition to Saturday's actions, organizers plan demonstrations in numerous other cities as well as several less dramatic activities here on Friday, the day before the inauguration.

Workers led by black community organizer John Gibson have scheduled a rally in Meridian Hill Park (also known as Malcolm X Park) at 5 p.m. in support of what they call self-determination for both the District of Columbia and Vietnam.

The rally will be followed by a mass meeting and political film show at 7:30 p.m. at nearby All Souls Unitarian Church and an all-night vigil at the James Forrestal Building at 10th Street and Independence Avenue SW, starting at 11 p.m. The Forrestal Building was chosen, a spokesman said, because "it's another Pentagon" and symbolizes the racism of the U.S. military.

Also on Friday, a 12-member PCPJ delegation will present a petition with some 25,000 signatures at the White House gates at 2 p.m., demanding that the United States sign the tentative accord reportedly reached during the Paris peace talks last Oct. 26.

The Student Mobilization Committee, a campus adjunct of NPAC, has called for a "National Day of Student Antiwar Protest" on Friday with teach-ins and small scale rallies planned on some campuses here.

The bewildering array of organizations brings with it an equally bewildering range of ideas on tactics and targets.

Some favor focusing pressure on the White House and President Nixon to stop the war; others feel Congress should feel the heat. Some want the protest to be physically close to the inaugural ceremonies; others want to give the impression of ignoring them.

NPAC, a tightly disciplined group run in considerable part by Trotskyist cadres of the Socialist Workers Party, seeks immediate, unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. military forces.

PCPJ, a looser coalition of free-wheeling radicals and unaligned groups, favors U.S. signing of the Oct. 26 accords and a congressional cutoff of funds for the war.

At a press conference called by the Student Mobilization Committee last Thursday, representatives of almost a dozen campus and student organizations threw their support behind the NPAC-PCPJ mass march, but expressed varying views about its purpose and effectiveness.

They ranged from Layton Olsen of the National Student Lobby who urged conventional end-the-war lobbying pressure on Congress to Ron Ehrenreich, National Student Association vice president, who said he was "fed up with demonstrations" that he said were an ineffective political tool and suggested more militant actions as an alternative.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 17, 1973]

A PROTESTING OF THE PROTESTS (By Calvin Zon)

District Police said yesterday that they now expect about 20,000 demonstrators to take part in anti-war protests on Inauguration Day, about five times the number they had originally predicted.

Anti-war groups yesterday reiterated their expectation that "tens of thousands" will converge here Saturday, but they declined to make a specific estimate. In filing for their parade permit, they told police to expect as many as 50,000.

The main anti-war event is the NPAC-PCPJ-sponsored "March Against Death" during the inaugural ceremonies. Protesters will assemble at the Lincoln Memorial at noon for a march down Constitution Avenue to a 1:30 p.m. rally at the Washington Monument.

Other Inaugural Day protests called by various groups are expected to draw much smaller contingents.

At 10 a.m., the Yippies will join forces with the Students for a Democratic Society and the Progressive Labor party for a march from 8th and H Streets NE to a rally at Union Station Plaza near the Capitol.

Yippe and SDS spokesmen said in telephone interviews yesterday that they had abandoned earlier plans for "civil disobedience" and other forms of disruption. They said a permit for their demonstration was granted yesterday.

The Vietnam Veterans Against the War plan to march at 11 a.m. from Arlington Cemetery across Memorial Bridge to a symbolic peace treaty signing ceremony on the west side of the Reflecting Pool.

A group calling itself the Sign the Treaty Coalition says it is seeking a permit for a peaceful protest along the Inaugural Parade route.

In addition to Saturday's actions, other outdoor protests are planned. At 5 p.m. Friday, the newly formed D.C. Coalition for Self-Government and Peace plans a rally in Malcolm X Park to demand what they call self-determination for both Vietnam and the District.

The rally will be followed by an all-night vigil at the James Forrestal Building at 10th Street and Independence Avenue to begin at 11 p.m.

An "Inauguration of Conscience" church service will be held at 2 p.m. Sunday at Metropolitan United Methodist Church, Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues NW.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1973]

PROTESTS TO GO ON, TRUCE OR NOT (By Mary McGrory)

At the headquarters of the National Peace Action Coalition, one of the three groups planning an "Inauguration of Conscience" next weekend, the news that peace is again at hand caused nothing but raised eyebrows. "We expected something like this," says Jerry Gordon, a Cleveland lawyer who came

here 2½ years ago to devote his full time to anti-war demonstrations. "Nixon is alarmed by the acceleration of anti-war sentiment around the world, and he is trying to pacify and tranquilize the country so he can get through the inauguration without embarrassment, just the way he did it on Oct. 26 to get through the election."

Some 300 volunteers around the country are organizing Saturday's counter-inaugural. Nobody in the NPAC or its ally, the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, will predict the turnout. The hope is that "tens of thousands" will be on hand to express their disapproval of Nixon's war policies.

"This is one demonstration he can't leave town for," says Gordon.

New York City is planning to send 100 busloads and two trains. Morgantown, W. Va., not a bastion of anti-war sentiment, will send four buses, and even Muncie, Ind., will be represented.

No cancellations were received following the dramatic announcement from Key Biscayne of a bombing halt and a new accord between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho.

"We're using Nixon's campaign slogan, 'Now more than ever,'" says Michael Myerson, a spokesman for PCPJ. "The demonstrations will put pressure on him to sign the agreement, if there is one."

Both groups are agreed that the gathering on Saturday will also constitute a belated American mass protest against the Christmas bombing of Hanoi. World reaction, which may have been a factor in the president's decision to stop it, has been intense, but no public protest has yet taken place in the United States.

Doris Kanin, who coined the phrase, "Inauguration of Conscience" for a church service at the Metropolitan National United Methodist Church an affair which will bring together anti-war bishops and generals reports that people are "firmer than ever" about coming. After the Key Biscayne declaration, House Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill joined the endorsers of the Sunday service. One of the speakers will be Charlotte Christian, a POW wife who believes peace is at hand, but things should be said.

The three sets of organizers hope that many "respectables," meaning the middle-aged and middle-class, in contrast to the usual activist young will show up this weekend, including Republicans outraged by recent events.

The labor unions, with the exception of the Amalgamated Meat-Cutters Union, have steered clear of the Counter Inaugural, on the grounds, as one leader put it, that it "would be like busting up a man's wedding."

Patrick Gorman, the elderly president of the meat-cutters, said he could not explain why the other labor chieftains failed to come forward.

"I'll just say that my people are sick and tired of the crimes being committed in their names," he said. Today's news won't affect them. There will be four busloads from Chicago and Milwaukee. They raised the money for this and they will spend it.

Counter inaugural forces derived their biggest spiritual lift from Leonard Bernstein, who is coming here to conduct Haydn's "Mass in Time of War" at the National Cathedral while Eugene Ormandy is leading the Philadelphia Orchestra through the "1812 Overture" and other musical clichés at the Kennedy Center. Bernstein's initiative has given the anti's a clear aesthetic edge, they feel.

Four years ago, when Richard Nixon was first inaugurated, Rennie Davis ran a grubby little counter-encampment and was condemned by one and all for failing to grasp the conventional wisdom that "Nixon knows he's got to end it." Four years, 20,000 U.S. Combat losses, two invasions and one savage Christmas bombing later, serious atten-

tion is being paid to counter-inaugural activities, even, it would seem, by the recluse in the White House.

"We don't count on Congress," says Gordon. "We count on masses of people in the street to stop this war. The people who run this country don't like it when people take to the streets. They tell Richard Nixon so. We've never been able to stop it, but we have made him step back. I think he did this, made this announcement, to undercut the demonstration. He knows as well as we do, that it's going to be big."

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT CIVIL SERVANTS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation in the House today almost identical to that offered in 1951 by the then-Senator Nixon to protect civil servants.

This bill would shield civil servants from transfer, demotion or harassment after testifying before congressional committees.

In 1951, then-Senator Nixon offered legislation that would have labelled as "retaliation" any change within a year of a civil servant's status after testifying before a congressional panel.

In April of 1951, Senator Nixon told the other body:

Unless protection is given to witnesses who are members of the Armed Forces or employees of the Government, the scheduled hearings will amount to no more than a parade of yes-men for administration policies as they exist.

I am urging President Nixon to support this legislation. I am hopeful that he agrees now, as he did in 1951, that all civil servants called to testify before congressional committees should present their honest views—not mouth the current administration's party line.

Specifically, this legislation would strengthen 18 U.S. Code 1505 which prohibits the intimidation of harassment of witnesses before administrative bodies, or the Congress.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Gordon W. Rule has been shipped to the Navy's equivalent of Siberia for honesty in answering Senator PROXMIRE's questions before the Joint Economic Committee on December 19, 1972.

This bill would make it criminal offense to harass someone like Mr. Rule. It would also protect him in his present job unless he was accused of malfeasance, misfeasance or nonfeasance and exhausted all of his Civil Service Commission remedies.

Congress has the right to investigate the policies of the administration in order to formulate legislation. The Nixon administration, through its own harassment, intimidation, and eventual transfer of Gordon Rule, is attempting to frustrate Congress' basic right to investigate the executive branch. Civil servants deserve protection.

RUSSELL L. FUQUA

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1972, Mr. Russell L. Fuqua, the man who accompanied the first German warhead from the Naval Research Laboratory to White Sands Proving Ground, passed away. He was eulogized by a constituent of mine, JOC James Glynn, USNR, of Wichita, Kans., in the White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., on October 20, 1972. Considering Mr. Fuqua's dedication to his country, I think this article is deserving of being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article reads as follows:

LONG-TIME EMPLOYEE OF NAVY, R. L. FUQUA
DIES AT ALAMOGORDO

(By JOC James Glynn, USNR)

The man who accompanied the first German V-2 warhead from the Naval Research Laboratory to White Sands Proving Ground is dead.

Russell L. Fuqua, 60, a 26-year veteran of Federal service at WSMR and whose familiar western straw hat graced a hat rack at the 789 Club at lunchtime, died at his home, 611 Madison, in Alamogordo Monday, Oct. 16.

In June 1946, nine Marines and two sailors were aboard a silver C-47 cargo plane that banked slowly and descended over the Organ Mountains to land at Condon Army Auxiliary Air Field. Among the crew was a young Marine—Corporal Russell Fuqua.

Fuqua was a rocket expert attached to the Marine Rocket Detachment in Camp Pendleton, Calif. when he was summoned to the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington for this assignment. Keen perception told him that the metallic cargo within the plane and the remote desert station below was to herald a new age in modern science.

A rugged individual, Fuqua enlisted in the Marines Jan. 2, 1941.

Conditioned to a hot climate—having been stationed in the Caribbean with the 9th and 13th Marine Defense Battalions in 1943—Fuqua spent his first weeks at White Sands in a prefab Army personnel camp (now the site of Bldg. 100). Later, he commuted to the post from Alamogordo Army Air Field (Holloman AFB).

Before his Caribbean duty, Fuqua was attached to the 5th Marine Division in Parris Island. Following duty at a Naval Air Station in Florida, he was transferred to Camp Pendleton where he attended rocketry classes at the California Institute of Technology.

Four days after his discharge from the Marines on Nov. 14, 1946, Fuqua was hired by the Army as a civilian worker at White Sands Proving Ground. Three years later he transferred to the Navy where he worked for NOMTF (then NOMTU) in the Navy Garage as a mechanic and heavy equipment operator. He remained there until his retirement on June 30, 1972.

Arturo O. Pena, general foreman in the Public Works Department and Fuqua's superior for 23 years, acclaimed the former Marine corporal as a highly-dedicated and devoted worker.

In 1970 Fuqua received a certificate of achievement for outstanding service.

"What can I say about a man like him," Pena exclaimed, "he was part of NOMTF. I'll miss him very much."

In June 1972, Fuqua was honored by Pena and his fellow employees at a coffee in the Navy Garage. Capt. H. E. Davies, Jr., commanding officer of NOMTF, presented him

with a replica of the NOMTF ship's bell and a "Desert Rat" certificate.

A widower, Fuqua is survived by his daughter, Mrs. Glen Thompson, Truth or Consequences; a brother, James Fuqua, Nashville, Tenn.; and a sister, Mrs. Orville Moss, Gainsboro, Tenn.

He was a member of the Alamogordo Evening Lions Club and BPOE Lodge 1897.

Fuqua was born in Gainsboro, Tenn. on June 26, 1912.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1970

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1973, I joined with Congressman THONE and others of my colleagues in introducing two measures to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. I also cosponsored these measures last session when problems with the act first became evident. Their introduction in the 93d Congress affirms my belief that the enactment of these amendments is necessary to assure that the act and its enforcement are fair and equitable for all concerned.

When the Occupational Safety and Health Act was enacted by Congress in 1970, it had my strong support. It has my support today. The rate of industrial injuries and fatalities has been tragically high and firm action is needed to reduce it. I believe the Occupational Safety and Health Act is a vitally needed step toward assuring so far as possible to every man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions.

At the same time, however, we must recognize that OSHA has instituted Federal controls over thousands of businesses never before covered by such regulations. Confusion and difficulties have inevitably resulted in both administering and complying with the law. The purpose of the amendments I am sponsoring is to clarify the intent of both the act and the promulgated regulations so that compliance can be more easily and effectively achieved, particularly for small businessmen, who are encountering Federal safety regulations for the first time.

The first amendment I have introduced would require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the differences between hazards to employees in the light, residential construction industry and the hazards to employees in the heavy construction industry. When the OSHA regulations for the construction industry were first promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, they were based on national consensus standards which had been developed chiefly in terms of heavy, commercial construction. Over the past year, I have received letters from many small, residential construction firms who point out that some of these standards are simply not applicable to the hazards of their businesses. Further, complying with these inapplicable

standards means their costs will greatly increase, and these costs may well prove prohibitive for their business.

Under present law, the Secretary of Labor has the authority and responsibility to revise the OSHA regulations as needed in order to more accurately reflect the known hazards in an industry. The function of my amendment is to accelerate the process of revision so that firms in the light, residential construction industry, many of whom are small and have limited working capital, will not have to make unnecessary financial outlays in order to comply with inapplicable standards. I think it important to note that this amendment would not exempt any firms from compliance with OSHA standards. Therefore, the protection of the employees in the light, residential construction industry under the act will not be interrupted or endangered.

Firms in the construction industry have not been the only businesses to encounter problems in understanding and complying with what often appear to be unnecessary and arbitrary regulations. During the past year, I have dealt with employers in a variety of businesses and they have expressed confusion, fear, and resentment at the way in which the OSHA regulations are being enforced.

Most of the employers I have spoken with are small businessmen, who cannot afford a safety engineer to interpret the regulations and determine how they can comply. Therefore, they must struggle themselves to read and understand the hundreds of pages of regulations which have been issued. Inevitably, problems have resulted. Sometimes the businessman simply cannot understand the regulations; sometimes the regulations seem inapplicable to his particular situation. Sometimes the employer believes he has found a better way to protect his employees against a hazard; other times he may feel that a regulation makes it impossible for him to continue offering a particular service, or even, perhaps, remain in business.

Unfortunately, the businessman receives little help in resolving these problems because, by law, the Federal OSHA inspectors cannot visit his firm to advise him without also penalizing him for any violations they find. The employer is thus left in a quandary as to whether to invest considerable financial resources in making perhaps unnecessary or incorrect changes. He is left to wonder whether he should give up part of his business or risk a heavy fine should it be determined that he is violating a regulation.

The businessmen I know are responsible employers, concerned about the safety of their employees. They have already taken action to comply with the requirements they understand and they readily state that many of the regulations are sensible and long needed. They strongly resent, however, being penalized for violating standards they do not understand. I share their view that such penalties place an unfair burden on them.

I am therefore sponsoring a second amendment which provides that penalties will not be assessed for violations

which are corrected within the prescribed abatement period. The purpose of the amendment is to provide employers with an opportunity to receive help in understanding and complying with the regulations without placing themselves in financial jeopardy. While maintaining the requirements for compliance and thus protecting the employees, the measure will do much, in my opinion, to reduce the resentment of businessmen and encourage voluntary compliance.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my full support for the objectives of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. It is because I support these objectives that I am sponsoring these amendments to aid employers in complying with the law. By easing some of the difficulties which the act has created for businessmen, we will be improving the cause of occupational safety and health for all.

THE THIBODAUX HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the arrival in Washington today of the Thibodaux High School "Tigers" Marching Band. As the inauguration ceremonies grow near, Mr. Speaker, we are once again reminded by the news media that there are a handful of young people in the United States whose contempt for our national leaders, policies, and institutions is such that they wish to disrupt these proceedings in order to dramatize their opinions. I find it particularly refreshing that there are 130 young people from my home State of Louisiana who have come to Washington not to disrupt, but to help make the celebration more enjoyable and more meaningful to the many millions of Americans who will be watching.

There is another way in which these young people typify the great majority of our American youth: they believe in the old adage that anything worth doing is worth doing well. This is evidenced by their music, Mr. Speaker: Their selection to represent Louisiana in the inaugural parade is the latest in a number of impressive achievements. Among the awards the Thibodaux Band has won are:

Outstanding concert band in Division A, First International Band Festival, Vienna, Austria, July 1972;

They were 1971 and 1972 State champions for concert and wind ensemble;

Nine Louisiana Music Education Association—LMEA—State sweepstake trophies;

Four LMEA marching trophies in 4 years of competition;

Individual honors to over 400 students who have played in the band;

An average of five students per year qualifying to participate in the Louisiana All-State Band;

A recent proclamation by the Governor of Louisiana declaring Thibodaux to be "Band City of Louisiana."

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the many honors which have been bestowed on the Thibodaux High School Band over the years. I would like to give the names of the 130 young people who will be marching in our inaugural parade tomorrow, so that they may achieve some small measure of the recognition due them, and serve as an inspiration to the many millions of young Americans who do not seek to tear down our system, who would rather help build it and improve it:

LIST OF THIBODAUX HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Susan Acosta, Dale Adams, George Adams, Terry Adams, Mike Battaglia, Lisa Bechel, Tommy Braud, Don Champayne, Cynthia Chiasson, Marc Clausen, Rebecca Conner, Chris Daigle, Faye Daigle, Terry Daigle, Ryan Dodge, Mary Foote, Carol Foret, Stella Hall, Carol Hardy, Debbie Hebert, Rosalind Heck, Daniel Jeanson, Norman Jones, Roxanne Kearns, Barry Landry, Lena Landry, and Patrice Lasseigne.

Gwen LeBlanc, Molly Ledet, Rosemarie Ledet, Mike Madere, Bonnie Martin, Bonnie Melancon, Patty Naquin, Carolyn Oliver, Sylvia Ordoyne, Amelie Pontif, Sabrina Richard, Barry Rodrigue, Linda Shaver, Lynette Taylor, Jonni Thibodeaux, Jack Weeks, Randy Adams, Wanda Adams, Robert Blanchard, Martha Boudreaux, Donald Bourgeois, Darlene Christensen, Barry Clement, Denise Diaz, Cindy Dugruise, David Dupre, and Judy Dupre.

Gina Hebert, Andrew Hoffman, Sherry Kinchen, Kathleen Koscher, Dwight Landry, Richard LeRay, Susan Manery, David McDonald, Keith McDonald, William Melancon, Pam Morello, Marcus Morvant, Mary Morvant, Margaret Naquin, Jeanne Peltier, Beth Percle, Melissa Ray, Annie Robertson, Angela Robichaux, Ann Rodrigue, Charlene Scott, Sandra Thibodeaux, Bonnie Angellos, Wayne Gros, Sonoma Miller, David Troxler, and Dennis White.

Sammy Acosta, Wilbert Babin, Wallace Bernard, Cheryl Boudreaux, Bonnie Bourgeois, Tanya Caillouet, Brian Champayne, Edith Clark, Kim Danos, Cathy Darden, Carol David, Pam DeGravelles, Jennifer Dempster, Nick Edrington, Donna Fauchaux, James Foret, Marsha Frost, Marie Gullott, Ben Harris, Dennis Hebert, Albert Heck, Jo Horn, Bernadette Knight, Alice Landry, Cathy Landry, and Annette LeBlanc.

Ricky LeBlanc, Daria Lemmon, Renee LeRay, Vaughn Luquette, Vickilyn Luquette, Donna McMillan, Harriet Mire, Rhonda Mire, Carl Morvant, Charles Musso, Avery Morvant, Julie Naquin, Ricky Naquin, Anthony Oncale, George Otwell, Ann Percle, Ruby Percle, Keith Prejean, Christy Robertson, Lisa Rodrigue, Mona Rodrigue, Brenda Rushing, Ramona Savell, Michelle Taylor, Davan Wall, Alice Zeringue, and Thaddeus Zeringue.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadis-

tically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

VIEW FROM WITHIN: THE "MYTH" OF TODAY'S MOVIES

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the past few years have seen a great deal of praise and criticism directed at the American motion picture industry. No one contests that during the last decade many changes have been at work in our society, and I believe that the motion picture industry has realistically perceived these changes and reflected them through its medium of entertainment.

Jack Valenti, as president of the Motion Picture Association of America, represents the major movie companies; he recently wrote an excellent article for the Washington Post on the state of the industry today. I would like to read this article into the Record at this time.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 31, 1972]
VIEW FROM WITHIN: THE "MYTH" OF TODAY'S MOVIES

(By Jack Valenti)

(NOTE.—Are movies worse than ever? Has Hollywood sold out to the pornographers? Why don't they make them like they used to? Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, which represents the major movie companies, is frequently asked such questions. In this article, he defends today's movies against their critics and dismisses some complaints as "myths." Valenti, MPAA president since 1966, was formerly special assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson. He is the author of "Bitter Taste of Glory," nine profiles of powerful men faced with crisis (World Publishing, 1971).)

Myths spring up like some random fog, blurring all those asylums of the mind where rational judgment is supposed to reside. The myth of the movie is one of the fuzziest of the new legends because it is funded by a false environment.

The myth goes as follows: Why can't we make movies like we used to? The movie today is too frank and I don't like what I see and hear on the screen.

What this myth keeps alive is the notion that life can stand still in a world wearied, frightened, compressed, disfigured by discontent and rising expectations and yet alive with the possibilities of hope. In such a world then, the movie would be Peter Pan, unchanged and unchanging.

Since 1945, we have been through two wars, recession, inflation, rebellion on the campus, insurrection in the streets, insurgency in the church, generational gaps and racial torment; we have been shrunk by the jet and scared to death by the atom; assassins roam the alleys killing our leaders; old values are under attack and old customs are abandoned. Must movies remain the only creative force unaffected by this change? Can we take the country back to the '40s?

The truth is movies like everything else in the land react to change. Films don't invent change. They only follow it.

Movies used to be the family habit. But today we have television and a hundred other leisure time activities that compete for family attention. Films no longer have a common

denominator. They are made for varying audiences because there is no longer one American audience for movies, or for anything else.

Out of the almost 2,000 films rated in the last four years by the Motion Picture Association rating board in California, some 434 films have been rated "G," which means for the whole family, and 783 "PG," parental guidance suggested. There is no shortage of family films, but there is a shortage of family audiences.

The myth of movie audiences swarming to the "racier" movies is just that, a myth. Of the 50 top-grossing films last year, 65 per cent were rated G or PG, but being rated "R" doesn't mean racy. It simply means adult, because of language, theme, sex or violence.

The notion that movie pornography in some wild contagion loose in the land collides with the fact that the best estimate of box office gathered in by the so-called "hard porn" film is about 3 per cent of total gross. Hardly an epidemic. Pornography is more talked about than seen.

It is my judgment that if the child is instructed in the home to have respect for values, to be set right about fair play and honest living and a sense of decency, no movie, no book, no TV show, no bowling alley, no violent, flawed society is going to corrupt him or her. On the other hand, if parents abandon their parental responsibilities, no censor, no government will be able to correct what is wrong.

The movie myth also breeds a curious perversity in public opinion.

A large metropolitan newspaper bans all X-rated film advertising, yet prints in full-page bannering headlines a story about rape full of the most explicit, unadorned description, which if depicted in a film would be rated X.

There are television shows available to anyone turning a dial which describe sex therapy and discuss sexual aberrations not to be allowed in G and PG films.

Some critics have railed at "A Clockwork Orange," the work of one of the few acknowledged film geniuses, Stanley Kubrick, for its violence. Yet on a thousand TV news shows there is violence galore, unending, irresistible, as it happens, in living color in the living room. Moreover the number of people who watch TV boggles the mind. More people will see the three national network news shows in two nights than will see all the movies in all the theaters in this country in one month.

Finally, the film industry is the only American enterprise which deliberately turns away business because of its commitment to the American parent. No one else in entertainment or communications does that.

Today, more than ever, there are more motion pictures for all kinds of tastes—"Fiddler on the Roof," "James Bond," "Patton," "Sounder," "The Godfather," "Young Winston," "Cabaret," "1776," "Day of the Jackal," "The Poseidon Adventure," "Lost Horizons," "Day of the Dolphin," "Sky-jacked" (as examples)—some in exhibition, some yet to come, but all different, for different audiences; some sophisticated in approach, some simply designed, but all entertaining.

Perhaps all of us ask too much and hope too much. We scatter our seed in the wind. We plant our fervor and our doubts in the same pattern and ride the heart of the tempest. There are, we find, no certainties, only puzzlement, and if our community seems to be living in an eternal spin-dry, maybe it is better than skidding down a washboard. That is what the movie of the 70s is all about, giving each of us a chance to wash away our old dreams or perhaps to dream new ones.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS ON THE PRESIDENTIAL WAR

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has written an excellent and penetrating analysis of the Presidential war powers. Professor Schlesinger, the Albert Schweitzer Professor of the Humanities at the City University of New York, states that the inability to control Presidential war is now revealed as the great failure of the Constitution, and he concedes, as many of us have maintained, that the Congress, in recent times, has been impotent in checking the expansive powers of the Presidency.

Professor Schlesinger's article which appeared in the January 7, 1973, New York Times magazine, is most worthy of our full attention:

PRESIDENTIAL WAR: "SEE IF YOU CAN FIX ANY LIMIT TO HIS POWER"

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

Abraham Lincoln to W. H. Herndon, February 15, 1848: "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so, whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect. . . . If, today, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us,' but he will say to you 'be silent; I see it, if you don't.'"

"Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power"—when he thus advised his friend Herndon, Congressman Lincoln of course had President Polk in mind. Yet by contemporary standards Polk would be in the clear. He had meticulously observed the constitutional forms: he had asked Congress to declare war against Mexico, and Congress had done so. But the situation Lincoln imagined a century and a quarter ago has now come much closer to the fact. For war at Presidential pleasure, nourished by the crises of the 20th century, waged by a series of activist Presidents and removed from processes of Congressional consent, has by 1973 made the American President on issues of war and peace the most absolute monarch (with the possible exception of Mao Tse-tung of China) among the great powers of the world.

President Nixon did not invent Presidential war nor did President Johnson. In their conceptions of Presidential authority, they drew on theories evolved long before they entered the White House and defended in general terms by many political scientists and historians, this writer among them. But they went further than any of their predecessors in claiming the unlimited right of the American chief executive to commit American forces to combat on his own unilateral will; and President Nixon has gone further in this respect than President Johnson.

In 1970, without the consent of Congress, without even consultation or notification, President Nixon ordered the American ground invasion of Cambodia. In 1971, again without consent or consultation, he ordered

an American aerial invasion of Laos. In December, 1972, exhilarated by what he doubtless saw as an overwhelming vote of personal confidence in the 1972 election, he renewed and intensified the bombing of North Vietnam, carrying it now to such murderous extremes as to make his predecessor seem in retrospect a model of sobriety and restraint—all this again on his personal say-so. And so assured and confirmed does President Nixon now evidently feel in the unilateral exercise of such powers that he does not bother any longer (as he did for a moment in 1970) to argue the constitutional issue. If he should now choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade North Vietnam in order to prevent the North Vietnamese from attacking American troops, how can anyone stop him? Congress might see no threat in North Vietnam to the security of the United States, but: "Be silent; I see it, if you don't."

How have we reached this point? For throughout American history Presidents have acknowledged restraints, written and unwritten, on their unilateral power to bring the nation into war. The written restraints are to be found in the Constitution; the unwritten restraints in the nature of the democratic process. Why, after nearly two centuries of independence, should there now seem to be no visible checks on the personal power of an American President to send troops into combat?

This was plainly not the idea of the Constitution. The provision in Article I, Section 8, conferring on Congress the power to declare war was carefully and specifically designed to deny the American President what Blackstone had assigned the British King—"the sole prerogative of making war and peace." As Lincoln went on to say in his letter to Herndon, it was this power of kings to involve their people in wars that "our [Constitutional] Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where Kings have always stood."

How did we get from Lincoln's *no-one-man* doctrine to the position propounded by President Johnson in 1966: "There are many, many who can recommend, advise, and sometimes a few of them consent. But there is only one that has been chosen by the American people to decide"? The process of placing our Presidents where kings had always stood has been gradual. In the early 19th century most Presidents respected the role of Congress in decisions of war and peace against sovereign states. Even a President like Jackson, otherwise so dedicated to enlarging the executive power, referred the recognition of the Republic of Texas to Congress as a question "probably leading to war" and therefore a proper subject for "previous understanding with that body by whom war can alone be declared and by whom all the provisions for sustaining its perils must be furnished." Polk may have presented Congress with a *fait accompli* when he provoked a Mexican attack on American forces in disputed territory, but he did not claim that his authority as Commander in Chief allowed him to wage war against Mexico without Congressional authorization (*cf.*, President Nixon explaining why such authorization was not required for his invasion of Cambodia; he was only meeting his "responsibility as Commander in Chief of our armed forces to take the action I consider necessary to defend the security of our American men").

In the course of the 19th century, however, the Congressional power to declare war began to ebb in two opposite directions—in cases where the threat seemed too trivial to require Congressional consent and in cases

where the threat seemed too urgent to permit Congressional consent. Thus, many 19th-century Presidents found themselves confronted by minor situations that called for forcible response but appeared beneath the dignity of formal Congressional declaration or authorization—police actions in defense of American honor, lives, law or property against roving groups of Indians, slave traders, smugglers, pirates, frontier ruffians or foreign brigands. So the habit developed of the limited executive employment of military force without reference to Congress. Then in the early 20th century McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt began to commit military force without Congressional authorization not only against private groups but against sovereign states—McKinley in China, T.R. in the Caribbean. Since Congress agreed with most of these uses of force, it acquiesced in initiatives that soon began to accumulate as formidable precedents.

As far as cases where the threat seemed too urgent to permit the delay involved in summoning Congressmen and Senators from far corners of a sprawling nation, this was a possibility that the framers of the Constitution themselves had envisaged. Madison had thus persuaded the Constitutional Convention to give Congress the power not to "make" but to "declare" war in order to leave the executive "the power to repel sudden attacks." Given the hazards and unpredictabilities of life, no sensible person wanted to put the American President into a constitutional straitjacket. No one wrote more eloquently about the virtues of strict construction than Jefferson. Yet Jefferson, who was at bottom a realist, also wrote: "To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the ends to the means. . . . The line of discrimination between cases may be difficult; but the good officer is bound to draw it at his own peril, and throw himself on the justice of his country and the rectitude of his motives." In other words, when the life of the nation is at stake, Presidents might be compelled to take extraconstitutional or unconstitutional action. But, in doing so, they were placing themselves and their reputations under the judgment of history. They must not believe, or pretend to the nation, that they were simply executing the Constitution.

So when Lincoln in the most dreadful crisis of American history took a series of actions of dubious legality in the 10 weeks after the attack on Fort Sumter, he fully recognized what he was doing and subsequently explained to Congress that these measures, "whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon under what appeared to be a popular demand and a public necessity; trusting then as now that Congress would readily ratify them." Though he derived his authority to take such actions from his constitutional role as Commander in Chief, he was always conscious of the distinction between what was constitutionally normal and what might be justified only by a most extraordinary emergency. "I felt that measures, otherwise unconstitutional," he wrote in 1864, "might become lawful by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the Constitution, through the preservation of the nation."

So, too, when Franklin Roosevelt in our second most acute national crisis took a series of actions designed to enable England to survive against Hitler, he obtained in the case of the destroyer deal not only a favorable interpretation of a Congressional statute but the private approval of the Republican candidate for President. In the case of lend-lease, he went to Congress. In the case of his North Atlantic "shoot-at-sight" policy, though the threat to the United States from Nazi Germany could be persuasively deemed some-

what greater than that emanating 30 years later from Cambodia or Laos, and though his commitment of American forces was far more conditional, Roosevelt did not claim in the Nixon style that he was merely meeting his responsibility as Commander in Chief. Knowing that Congress, which would renew Selective Service by a single vote in the House, would hardly approve an undeclared naval war in the North Atlantic, Roosevelt in effect, like Jefferson and Lincoln, did what he thought was necessary to save the life of the nation and, proclaiming an "unlimited national emergency," threw himself upon the justice of his country and the rectitude of his motives. Since the Second World War there have been only two emergencies requiring immediate response. In the first, Harry Truman, confronted by the North Korean invasion of South Korea, secured a mandate from the United Nations; in the second, John Kennedy, confronted by Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba, secured a mandate from the Organization of American States.

Only Presidents Johnson and Nixon have made the claim that inherent Presidential authority, unaccompanied by emergencies threatening the life of the nation, unaccompanied by the authorization of Congress or of an international organization, permits a President to order troops into combat at his unilateral pleasure. President Johnson, it is true, liked to tease Congress by flourishing the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. But he did not really believe, as he said in an unguarded moment, that "the resolution was necessary to do what we did and what we're doing." President Nixon has abandoned even that constitutional fig leaf. William Rehnquist, then in the Department of Justice and later elevated to the Supreme Court as what President Nixon hilariously called a strict-constructionist appointee, said on behalf of his benefactor that the invasion of Cambodia was no more than "a valid exercise of his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to secure the safety of American forces." One somehow doubts that if Brezhnev used the identical proposition to justify the invasion of a neutral country by the Red Army, it would be received with entire satisfaction in Washington. Today President Nixon has equipped himself with so expansive a theory of the powers of the Commander in Chief, and so elastic a theory of defensive war, that he can freely, on his own initiative, without a national emergency, as a routine employment of Presidential power, go to war against any country containing any troops that might in any conceivable circumstance be used in an attack on American forces. Hence the new cogency of Lincoln's old question: "Study to see if you can fix any limits to his power in this respect."

In short, President Nixon has effectively liquidated the 11th paragraph of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. He has thereby removed the most solemn written check on Presidential war. He has sought to establish as a normal Presidential power what previous Presidents had regarded as power justified only by extreme emergencies and to be used only at their own peril. He does not, like Lincoln, confess to doubts about the legality of his course, or, like Franklin Roosevelt, seek to involve Congress when such involvement would not threaten the life of the nation. Nor has his accomplishment been limited to the exclusion of Congress from its constitutional role in the matter of war and peace. For he has also taken a series of unprecedented steps to liquidate the unwritten as well as the written checks on the Presidential war power.

What are these unwritten checks? The first is the role of the President himself. President Nixon has progressively withdrawn from public scrutiny. He was an invisible candidate in the 1972 campaign, and he promises to be an invisible President in his second term—invisible on all but carefully

staged occasions. Franklin Roosevelt used to hold press conferences twice a week; President Nixon holds them hardly at all and has virtually succeeded in destroying them as a regular means of public information. As William V. Shannon of *The Times* has written, he "has come as close to abolishing direct contact with reporters as he can." Even on matters of the highest significance he declines to expose himself to questioning by the press. Consider, for example, the Indochina peace negotiation. Does anyone suppose that if this had taken place in the previous Administration President Johnson would have trotted out Walt Rostow to discuss it with the media? Can anyone imagine Presidents Kennedy or Eisenhower or Truman dodging their personal responsibility in such momentous matters? Does anyone recall Franklin Roosevelt, returning from a wartime summit, asking Harry Hopkins or Admiral Leahy to explain it all to the press? Yet we have acquiesced so long in the Nixon withdrawal from Presidential responsibility that virtually no surprise is expressed when on such occasions he repeatedly retreats behind Dr. Kissinger (who, for his part, is permitted to undergo searching interrogation by Oriana Fallaci, but not by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee). Moreover, President Nixon, by finching from press conferences, not only deprives the American people of opinions and information to which they are surely entitled from their President but deprives himself of an important means of learning the concerns and anxieties of the nation. Obviously, he simply does not recognize much in the way of Presidential accountability to the people. As he recently put it: "The average American is just like the child in the family." And, presumably, father knows best.

A second check on Presidential war-making has often come from the executive establishment. Genuinely strong Presidents are not afraid to surround themselves with genuinely strong men and on occasion cannot escape the chore of listening to them. Historically, the Cabinet, for example, has generally contained men with their own views and their own constituencies—men with whom the President must in some sense come to terms. Lincoln had to deal with Seward, Chase, Stanton and Welles; Wilson with Bryan, McAdoo, Baker, Daniels and Houston; Roosevelt with Stimson, Hull, Wallace, Ickes, Biddle and Morgenthau; Truman with Marshall, Acheson, Byrnes, Vinson, Harriman, Forrestal and Patterson. But who in President Nixon's Cabinet will talk back to him—assuming, that is, they could get past the palace janissaries and into the Oval Office? The fate of those who have tried to talk back in the past is doubtless instructive: Where are Messrs. Hickel, Romney, Laird, and Peterson now? In his first term, President Nixon kept his Cabinet at arm's length; and in his second term he has put together what, with one or two exceptions, is the most anonymous Cabinet within memory, a Cabinet of clerks, of compliant and faceless men who stand for nothing, have no independent national position and are guaranteed not to defy Presidential whim. Most alarming of all in connection with Presidential war has been the deletion, so far as high policy is concerned, of the Department of State. In short, President Nixon, instead of exposing himself to the tempering influence of a serious exchange of views within the Government, has organized his executive establishment in a way to eliminate as far as humanly possible internal question or challenge about his foreign policy. And to complete his insulation from debate, the President does not even tell most of his associates what he intends to do.

A third check in the past has come from the media of opinion—from the newspapers and, in more recent years, from television. With all its manifest imperfections, the American press has played an indispensable role

through our history in keeping government honest. President Nixon, however, not only hides himself from the press and television, except on elaborately controlled occasions, but has launched a well-orchestrated campaign to weaken the mass media as sources of information and criticism.

He has tried a variety of methods—prior restraint on the publication of news; Vice-Presidential denunciations of erring newspapers and reporters; proposals to condition the renewal of television licenses on the elimination of anti-Administration material from network programs; subpoenas to compel reporters to surrender raw notes; even jailing newspapermen who decline to betray confidential sources to grand juries—this last a practice which would not be constitutional had it not been for the Nixon appointments to the Supreme Court.

The Nixon Administration has tried to justify such actions by complaining that it has been the target of exceptional persecution by the media. Why it should suppose this is hard to fathom. Not only has 80 per cent of the press backed Mr. Nixon in two elections, but the Presidency has supreme resources of its own in the field of communications, and no previous President has used them more systematically. In his relationship to the media, President Nixon can hardly be described as a pitiful, helpless giant. No President enjoys criticism, but mature Presidents recognize that, however distasteful a free press may on occasion be, it is, as Tocqueville said long ago, "the chief democratic instrument of freedom" and that in the long run government itself benefits from a healthy adversary relationship. But this is clearly not President Nixon's view. If his Administration has its way, the American press and television will become as compliant and as faceless as the President's own Cabinet.

Still another check on Presidential war has been a President's concern for public opinion. Here again, President Nixon differs sharply from his predecessors. He explained his peculiar idea of the role of public opinion in a democracy last Oct. 12 when he scolded what he termed "the so-called opinion leaders of this country" for not responding to "the necessity to stand by the President of the United States when he makes a terribly difficult, potentially unpopular decision." It is hard to imagine an idea that would have more astounded the framers of the American Constitution. Indeed, who before President Nixon would have defined the obligation, "the necessity," of American citizens, in peacetime and outside the Government, as that of automatically approving whatever a President wants to do? In the past it was naively supposed that the American system would work best when American citizens spoke their minds and consciences.

If President Nixon dismisses public opinion in the United States as disobedient and refractory when it dares dissent from the President, he is even more scornful of what in the past has served as another check on Presidential war—that is, the opinion of foreign nations. The authors of "The Federalist" emphasized the indispensability of "an attention to the judgment of other nations . . . In doubtful cases, particularly where the national councils may be warped by some strong passion or monetary interest, the presumed or known opinion of the impartial world may be the best guide that can be followed. What has not America lost by her want of character with foreign nations; and how many errors and follies would she not have avoided, if the justice and propriety of her measures had, in every instance, been previously tried by the light in which they would probably appear to the unbiased part of mankind?" President Nixon's attitude could not be more different. It is concisely revealed by the studied contempt with which he has treated the United Nations. Only re-

cently, he made it perfectly clear that he regards the post of United States Ambassador to the United Nations as less important than that of chairman of the Republican National Committee; at least one supposes that he thought he was promoting, not demoting, George Bush.

I began by suggesting that on issues of war and peace the American President is very likely the most absolute monarch in the world of great powers. The Soviet Union is in other respects a dictatorship, but, before Brezhnev makes a new move in foreign affairs, he must touch base with a diversity of forces in the Government and the party. It would be hard to name anyone with whom President Nixon touched base before he invaded Cambodia or resumed the obliteration of North Vietnam. Moreover, in other countries, dictatorships as well as democracies, failure in foreign policy can lead to political oblivion: Anthony Eden could not survive Suez, and in time the Cuban missile crisis did in Khrushchev. But Nixon, his tenure assured by the rigidity of the quadrennial election, will be running things in the United States until January, 1977.

With checks both written and unwritten inoperative, with Congress impotent, the executive establishment feeble and subservient, press and television intimidated, national opinion disdained, foreign opinion rejected, the fear of dismissal eliminated, our President is free to indulge his most private resentments and rages in the conduct of foreign affairs, and to do so without a word of accounting to Congress and the American people. Thus, on Dec. 18 he began the heaviest bombing of the whole ghastly war, but had not, by the time this article went to press nearly a fortnight later, personally vouchsafed any form of explanation to the nation or to the world. Unidentified White House officials did say, however, to *The New York Times*, that the President intended the terror to convey to Hanoi "the extent of his anger over what the officials say he regards as 11th-hour renegeing on peace terms be settled." Historians will have to settle the point as to which side started renegeing first, though strong evidence suggests that it was the Americans. But we will all have to suffer the consequences of a President whose policy, in the curt summation of that sober Scotsman, Mr. Reston of *The Times*, has become that of "war by tantrum."

Four more years? Is the American democracy really unable to fix any limits to the President's power to make war? The first line of defense must be the United States Congress, whose abdication over the years has contributed so much to the trouble we are in. The Senate passed a so-called War Powers Bill in April, 1972, but Vietnam was specifically exempted from its operation. In any case, though its objective is admirable, the bill itself is both unduly rigid and unduly permissive. Had it been on the statute book in past years, it would have prevented Roosevelt from protecting the British lifeline in the North Atlantic in 1941, and it would not have prevented Johnson from escalating the war in Vietnam. Given the power of any President to dominate the scene with his own version of a *casus belli*, the War Powers Bill, if it is ever enacted, would be more likely to become a means of inducing formal Congressional approval of warlike Presidential acts than of preventing such acts.

Congress must find another route to end American involvement in Indochina. But does Congress really possess the courage to assert those rights the loss of which has been such a constant and tedious theme of Congressional lamentation and self-pity? Perhaps it will at long last make a determined effort to reclaim its constitutional authority. The issue here is not (as some opponents of the war mistakenly suppose) the question

of formal declaration of war. Even in the 18th century, as Hamilton wrote in "The Federalist," the ceremony of formal declaration "has of late fallen into disuse." A decade after the adoption of the Constitution, Congress without a declaration but by legislative action brought the United States into naval war with France. As Chief Justice Marshall put it in deciding a case that arose out of the war: "The Congress may authorize general hostilities . . . or partial war." But, whether the hostilities be general or limited, war was considered to require Congressional authorization, and this is the issue today. It has been argued that Congress has implicitly authorized the Indochina war by voting appropriations in support of the war, and that argument is not without plausibility. But it is within the power of Congress to counter and cancel that argument by asserting a conflicting claim of authority.

Moreover, Congress can cut off funds for the continued prosecution of the war. But will even this restrain the President? Mr. Nixon has shown in other contexts his indifference to Congressional action. He has, for example, refused to expend funds appropriated by Congress for duly-enacted legislation. Senator Ervin recently estimated that Presidential impoundment has now reached the staggering sum of \$12.7-billion. In his state of postelection euphoria, as well as in his righteous wrath over the refusal of the North Vietnamese to roll over and cry uncle, President Nixon might conceivably ignore end-the-war legislation. He might even, I suppose, try to use impounded funds to continue the war.

Should this happen, the constitutional remedy would be impeachment. Certainly such conduct would represent a considerably more serious transgression than poor Andrew Johnson's defiance of a law—the Tenure-of-Office Act—which the Supreme Court itself eventually found to be unconstitutional. The House would have to adopt an impeachment resolution; a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required for conviction, with the Chief Justice presiding over the trial. If it seems unlikely that a President elected with more than 60 per cent of the vote should find himself in such a plight, one has only to reflect on the fate of the three other Presidents this century who also took more than 60 per cent—Harding, Franklin Roosevelt and Johnson, all of whom were in serious political trouble a year or two after their triumphs. Still, at this point, impeachment hardly seems a usable remedy or a probable outcome.

The inability to control Presidential war is now revealed as the great failure of the Constitution. That failure has not brought disaster to the nation through most of our history because most of our Presidents have been reasonably sensitive, in Justice Robert H. Jackson's great phrase, "to the political judgments of their contemporaries and to the moral judgments of history." When they have not been particularly responsive to the Constitution, the unwritten checks—above all, the power of opinion—have made them so. If no structural solution is now visible, the best hope is to reinvigorate the unwritten checks. Not only must Congress assert itself, but newspapers and television, governors and mayors, Mr. Nixon's "so-called opinion leaders" and plain citizens must demand an end to Presidential war. Where, for example, are all those virtuous conservative pillars of business and the bar who have spent most of their adult life walling about the Constitution? Where are they when what is threatened is not their money but the peace of the world? Where are they when the Constitution really needs them? Perhaps President Nixon is right, and in the end Americans are just like children in the family. Or perhaps Lincoln was right when he said: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."

FURTHER MEAT PRICE INCREASES—FURTHER PROOF ON NEED FOR PERMANENT REPEAL OF THE MEAT IMPORT QUOTA LAW

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of myself, and Representatives CORMAN, GIBBONS, and GRIFFITHS, I am introducing legislation to repeal the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964.

The Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 has always been an anticonsumer piece of legislation. It has consistently limited the supply and increased the cost of the cheaper grades of meat—the type of meat so vitally needed by large families and those on fixed and low incomes. But now, during what will probably be an extended period of skyrocketing food prices, it is more important than ever to increase the supply of processing meat—the type used in hamburgers and hot dogs—and to stabilize the price of these meats.

Realizing that the meat import quota law was hurting the consumer, the President—under authority given to him in the law—temporarily suspended the import restrictions. But temporary suspensions simply cannot work in this case. It takes a long time to build up herd sizes, to contract for the special shipping which

is required. And why should foreign producers, such as the Australians and New Zealanders be expected to make these long-range preparations when American market restrictions could be reimposed? In fact, to protect the stability of their meat markets, the Australians, for example, require that for every two and a half pounds of meat sold in the American market, 1 pound must be sold in other world markets—despite the fact that they would like to sell here and despite the fact that our producers are unable to adequately supply the demand for low-cost processing meats.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, I printed a table which listed prices of various categories of meat in the Chicago wholesale market. This table showed that most categories of meat have already reached or exceeded the price of meat for any time since August of 1971 when the economic stabilization program began. Because of rising feed grain prices, it is obvious that these meat prices will continue to rise. The price of meat will reach crisis levels within the next few months. Within a matter of weeks, millions of American families will be unable to afford meat on the dinner table.

The last figures listed in the table which I supplied for the RECORD were the Chicago market figures for January 5. I now have available the figures for this last Monday, January 15. Again, these latest figures show the accelerating increase in meat prices—particularly the lower grade processing meat prices:

	Mid-November	Mid-December	Jan. 5	Jan. 15
Choice:				
Steers, 6/700	50	57/57½	60	61½/62
Trimmed loins, 40/50	78/79	86/87	88	85/86
Ribs, 30/50	70	79/80	77/78	72
Processing:				
Full, carcass, bull, fresh	77	77½	79	80½
Full carcass, cow, fresh	74½/75	75½	77½	77½
Boneless beef, fresh, 90 percent lean	72½/73	73/73½	75½/76	76
Boneless chucks, fresh	74/74½	75	77	77
Trimmed, 85/90	67/67½	67	70½/71	71/71½
Imported:				
Cow, 90 percent	67½/67¾	71	76¼	77
Bull, 90 percent	71½/72	74½	78	78½/79
Shank meat	71/71½	74/74½	77/77½	78½

There are several startling facts which stand out from these figures. First, in the 8 weeks since mid-November, many of these common categories of meat have increased in price by over 10 percent. One item is even up by more than 20 percent. Second, between January 5 and January 15, the price of several choice cuts—loins and ribs—has actually decreased—while the price of processing meat continues upward—particularly the price of the tough, lean, imported meat which is used in stews and canned meat products. Needless to say, it is this processing meat, the type of meat that can be “spread out” through casseroles, stews, and meat sauces, which is most important to those with large families and those on fixed income. It is this meat which is experiencing the largest price increases.

Only if we absolutely repeal the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 can we expect an increased supply of this type of meat at stabilized prices. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will soon hold hearings on this problem and take action to prevent meat from being driven off the American dinner table.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, we observed the birthday of one of America's most gifted, compassionate, and determined moral leaders—the late Martin Luther King, Jr.

Throughout his active, turbulent life, Dr. King was a fearless advocate of non-violent action to bring about needed social change in our Nation. He dramatically and convincingly touched the conscience and soul of every American who sensed the need to “help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood.”

As a man who knew injustice firsthand, Dr. King was remarkably free of hate. As a man who was impatient with and outraged by the indignities and humiliations bestowed on some by their

fellowman, Dr. King dreamed of freedom and peace for all men—black and white.

Martin Luther King said once that “man dies when he refuses to stand up for that which is right.” Rather than preaching that violent revolution would free the oppressed, he called for a liberation of the American spirit which would shatter the myths and fears of people about one another. Building bridges—not walls—between people was the legacy of his life.

Those of us who share the commitment to justice of this man of great courage and vision know that much work remains to be done. We mourn his loss. Yet, his achievements and good example serve as an inspiration to all of us as we strive to join him on the mountaintop.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to again join with Mr. BROTZMAN and many other of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to create a standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. There is an urgent need for such a committee with expertise and comprehensive jurisdiction to deal with the complexities of environmental affairs. A review of the environmental achievements of the past two Congresses demonstrates that the present committee roster has prevented a truly comprehensive approach to environmental problems.

In the 91st Congress, the historic National Environmental Policy Act was reported to the House from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Clean Air Act amendments were considered in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the 92d Congress, landmark water quality legislation emerged from the Committee on Public Works; regulation of noise was considered in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the first Federal regulation of pesticide was established in legislation reported from the Agriculture Committee; and ocean dumping regulation in the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 was a subject of strong interest to Members of two House committees with overlapping jurisdictions in this area: Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works.

Within the executive branch, the Council on Environmental Quality has been established to provide comprehensive policy and advisory focus within that branch of government. Should not the Congress have a comparable unit?

The Environmental Protection Agency was formed in 1970 to deal comprehensively with environmental regulation, yet its Administrator reports that his Agency is within the jurisdiction of some 17 congressional committees—a factor which has often slowed down the legislation needed by EPA to operate effectively.

During the 92d Congress, as in the

91st, both Houses of Congress expressed their urgent concern with this fragmented, sometimes competitive approach to environmental legislation. Some 150 Members of the House, from both sides of the aisle, joined in sponsoring legislation to create a standing Committee on the Environment. In this Congress, it is absolutely essential that we establish the environmental focus we have been seeking for several years. I urge the immediate and favorable consideration of the resolution to amend the Rules of the House to create a Committee on the Environment.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. JOE NICKELL
AND BRIG. GEN. EDWARD R. FRY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell has retired as adjutant general of the State of Kansas following 21 years of distinguished service to his State and Nation. Those of us from Kansas knew him as a hard-working and dedicated officer who took pride in the National Guard. He also handled effectively his responsibilities as State selective service director. I salute General Nickell and extend warmest appreciation and best wishes to him for good health and happiness in the future.

Brig. Gen. Edward R. Fry, commander of the headquarters of the Kansas Air National Guard, has been appointed to succeed General Nickell. He is highly qualified to fill this important State position, and I extend congratulations and best wishes to him.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which discusses the significant contribution made by General Nickell during his tenure as adjutant general, and the outstanding qualifications of General Fry.

The editorial follows:

EXCEPTIONAL APPOINTMENT

The Kansas adjutant general, Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell, has announced his retirement after 21 years of distinguished and devoted service to the state and the National Guard.

General Nickell has served longer in his post than any other adjutant general in any state in the union. He is primarily responsible for the existence of 58 state-owned guard armories in towns all over Kansas, and he has received the Distinguished Service Medal of the National Guard Association.

He has had a varied career. He is a former Topeka attorney, was once a newspaperman and a radio news commentator. He served in World War I as an enlisted man. Upon his return, he enlisted in the National Guard, was commissioned a second lieutenant, and entered World War II as a major. He won honors and promotions and became adjutant general in 1951. He also served as state selective service director.

Big, bluff and rugged, General Nickell became a familiar figure at state functions and

has thousands of friends. He will be missed, but at the age of 76 he well deserves the retirement years that lie ahead of him.

In choosing his successor, Governor Docking has made an exceptionally fine appointment. The new adjutant general will be Brig. Gen. Edward R. Fry of Wichita, assistant adjutant general for air and commander of the headquarters of the Kansas Air National Guard at McConnell. He will be the first air guardsman to serve as adjutant general.

He, too, has excellent military credentials. A graduate of the Air Force Flying School, he received officer rank in 1942, and saw combat duty in World War II, completing 53 combat missions. He has been a brigadier general since 1960.

General Fry has attained a high reputation as commander of the Kansas Air National Guard. Because of its combat-readiness, his was one of three jet units in the nation called up in 1950, and for the same reason it was sent again to Korea in 1968 at the time of the Pueblo incident.

With him as adjutant general and commander of the Kansas National Guard we may expect the same high standards to prevail. The governor is to be commended for the excellence of this appointment.

END THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the Board of Trustees of the Villages of Great Neck Plaza adopted a resolution calling on all public officials to do all in their power to end the war in Indochina. Mayor Andrew L. Wurman transmitted a copy of the resolution to me last week.

Because I feel that the resolution from grassroots America eloquently expresses a call that the Congress must answer, I would like to insert it at this point in the RECORD. I hope that a majority of my colleagues will join with me in working toward the peace which we have been seeking for so long.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

The Board of Trustees of the Village of Great Neck Plaza would like to make the strongest possible expression of their feeling that the war in Vietnam must be brought to an immediate end through means of a negotiated settlement.

We deplore the recent resumption of the bombings which resulted in the needless loss of American servicemen as well as the death of innocent civilians. We wish to urge that the current bombing halt be continued indefinitely.

We call on the President to end the senseless slaughter which is morally offensive, and is in violation of the basic traditions of this country. We call on Congress to end all funds for the war, and to act collectively to insure the immediate end of hostilities in Southeast Asia.

We call on all public officials to exercise their leadership and speak out for an end to the war. We also wish to urge the public to demand, from their elected officials, to do all in their power to achieve an end to the war.

REPRESENTATIVE FORSYTHE EXPOSES NADER BIAS AND INACCURACY

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from New Jersey's Sixth District, Representative EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, has composed an illuminating and perceptive article regarding the activities of the Ralph Nader organization prior to the November elections.

Mr. FORSYTHE's article points out the inaccuracies of the Nader research and the biased approach of the Nader organization to its purported analysis of the Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the article speaks more eloquently than any words of mine, and I am attaching it to these remarks for the benefit of my colleagues who may not yet have read the article—and to all others who glean these pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE HOLES IN RALPH NADER'S "TRUTH"

(By Representative EDWIN B. FORSYTHE)

(A knight may fall if his thrusts aren't really on target)

If an American company manufactures a faulty product, one that consistently fails to meet advertising claims, how long will the consumer continue to purchase the product?

If a Congressman consistently promises but doesn't perform, how long can he expect to stay in office?

To both questions the answer is: Not very long. The voter remembers and so does the consumer. Both the businessman and the Congressman must answer for past performance.

But what about the so-called "consumer advocate"? Must he fulfill his self-proclaimed, self-advertised role of defending the cause of the embattled consumer? Where is the test?

The American people want to know what's happening on the inside of corporations, of government agencies and of Congressional offices.

And when such a figure as "consumer advocate" Ralph Nader offers such information, many are ready to listen and believe. But Ralph Nader does not have to face the test of the marketplace or the ballot box. Thus, his responsibilities are heavy. Just as he would like to see products and Congressmen above reproach, so must his own product be without fault.

If he is to cast stones against deception, his missiles must also be tossed without deceit—intentional or otherwise.

If he is to attack the government bureaucracy as inept and tangled in red tape, then his own organization must be free of such faults.

If he wants consumer advertising to fairly represent a product without misleading a potential purchaser, then his own interpretations, explanations and promotions must be equally accurate and direct.

If the American people's thirst for knowledge and truth about products and government is to be quenched, if their hope for honesty and quality is to be fulfilled without further disillusionment, then the "truth," as presented by Mr. Nader and others like him, must, in fact, be true. Mr. Nader's entire

Congress Project, released just prior to the November general election, was billed as a comprehensive report providing the American people with valuable information about their Congressmen.

MISSION UNACCOMPLISHED

There was, indeed, hope that a valuable contribution to the public's knowledge about their representatives would be made.

However, the mission was less than fulfilled. The heavy advance billing was not supported by a quality end product. If Mr. Nader had been subject to any "truth in advertising" test he would have failed, for his profiles were filled with misstatements and contradictions.

"The profiles are not evaluative in purpose," Mr. Nader's associates were quoted as saying. Yet, one after the other, profiles written about individual Congressmen contained subjective evaluations formed by the profile writers.

Usually, the writer was a college student and often he had a personal philosophy that showed a liberal bent. Unfortunately, this was often reflected in the evaluations.

While I had no real problems with my own profile, except for accuracy, I did not really believe it contained information that was not already generally known.

One of its earth-shattering evaluations was that someday I "may be recognized more for legislative activities than for the distinctive bow ties and slightly greying crew cut."

The appearance of evaluations in profiles that were not to be "evaluative in purpose" smacks of Mr. Nader's philosophy in the consumer field.

As Ralph K. Winter Jr. pointed out in "The Consumer Advocate Versus the Consumer," published by the American Enterprise Institute:

"When Mr. Nader criticizes the food industry for taking steps to 'sharpen and meet superficially consumer tastes at the cost of other critical needs,' one may fairly ask whose judgment it is that a taste is 'superficial' and whose judgment it is that a 'need' is 'critical.' In the circumstances mentioned, it seems rather evident that the judgment in question is solely Mr. Nader's."

In the Congress profiles, too, the judgment is also Mr. Nader's—or that of his collegiate investigators.

Then there is the question of accuracy, which denotes responsibility.

Even with the editorial tone of many of the profiles, they could have been of some value to discerning American readers. However, of what value is inaccurate material pawned off as truth?

FACTS THAT AREN'T

For example, my profile indicated that I voted in favor of a two-year extension of the draft, in 1971. The facts are that on April 1, 1971, I voted against the two-year extension. This was duly reported in the *Congressional Record* and *Congressional Quarterly*.

My staff brought this mistake to the attention of Mr. Nader's staff people more than two months before the final profile was published. Yet they failed to make the correction.

Meanwhile, profiles of members of the House Education and Labor Committee listed a number of "key" votes in the Committee. And many Nader explanations of the issues involved were wrong or misleading.

For example, one vote purportedly was either for or against using school aid funds for parochial or private nonprofit schools. In fact, that amendment was purely technical and did not pertain to any substantive issue. It was opposed by all but four members of the Committee, including many who favored using such funds for such schools—including myself.

Another amendment was described as prohibiting discrimination based on race in any

program of the Child Development Act. In fact, it would have given unidentified organizations or groups the right to veto a sponsor of a child development program if they offered a "substantial objection" to the sponsor. That hardly can be interpreted as banning discrimination, which is prohibited anyway under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

MURKINESS IN THE KNIGHT

These individual examples raise a question about the validity of the entire Nader report. The admission by a Nader staffer that the Education and Labor Committee vote profile was "borrowed" from the Democratic Study Group, instead of being compiled by Nader people, certainly adds grounds for skepticism.

Which brings us back to the question of responsibility; of producing an acceptable product as claimed. Are the American people being taken in once again—this time by the white knight who is their self-proclaimed savior?

In 1969, Robert Fellmeth, author of two "Nader Reports" on consumerism, was asked during a Congressional hearing whether a reference to "Nader's Raiders"—emblazoned on the back of such reports—constituted a fair statement. He admitted:

"I don't think so. I think it is very inaccurate for several reasons. First of all, it is inaccurate because Mr. Nader's involvement is crucial, but it is not as extensive as that name would imply. At least we are not investigating for him alone in a direct sense. Secondly, we are not raiders."

Mr. Fellmeth was in charge of the Nader Congress Project.

A Congressional staff member's attempt to reach him by telephone suffered the same fate that many Nader reports suggested constituents face when they seek to contact their Congressmen.

The call was switched to three different individuals. Finally, a young man answered the phone. He said Mr. Fellmeth was "busy." Could he help?

It turned out that he couldn't.

MINNESOTA STATE SENATE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS RESOLUTION ON THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Caucus of the Minnesota State Senate January 11 unanimously adopted the resolution on the Vietnam conflict that follows my remarks.

I believe the resolution, in the words of State Senator Harold G. Krieger, the minority leader of the Minnesota State Senate,

Fairly represents the majority opinion of the citizens of [Minnesota] when it . . . prayerfully urge[s] that all efforts be expended to reach . . . a settlement without further bombing of North Vietnam, and earnestly hope[s] that further fighting and bloodshed will not be necessary.

I might note, Mr. Speaker, that members of the Minnesota State Legislature are not elected by party label. The conservative caucus, however, is generally identified as the Republican side of the legislature.

RESOLUTION

The Conservative Caucus of the Minnesota State Senate hereby unanimously affirms its

support of the efforts of President Nixon and his administration to seek an immediate end of hostilities in Southeast Asia, the release of all American Prisoners of War, and a safe and prompt return of United States military personnel.

Recognizing that the Minnesota Legislature does not have full knowledge of the current status and problems of the peace negotiations, and not desiring to take any action that might undermine the success of those negotiations, we nevertheless prayerfully urge that all efforts be expended to reach such a settlement without further bombing of North Vietnam, and earnestly hope that further fighting and bloodshed will not be necessary.

THE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1973

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in 1971, 55,000 Americans died in traffic mishaps on the Nation's highways. Another 2 million suffered injury and upwards of \$40 billion in damages, direct and indirect, were sustained.

Because of our concern over this shocking slaughter, I introduced, and all of my colleagues on the Public Works Committee, including Chairman BLATNIK, joined with me in sponsoring, the Omnibus Highway Safety Act of 1973. That measure was incorporated as title II of the highway bill which died for absence of a quorum in the waning hours of the last session.

Since then, preliminary accident figures for 1972 have become available. Estimates indicate that over 57,000 people died on the Nation's highways. Injury and property damage rose commensurately.

What these figures say to me is that we are confronted with a bad situation—one which is growing worse with each passing year. Obviously, something has to be done, and done now, to arrest the spiraling toll of deaths, injuries, and associated property damage on the highways of our country.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced an expanded and refined version of last year's highway safety bill. In doing so, I have been joined by all Members on Public Works who cosponsored this legislation last year, including Chairman BLATNIK. I fully expect newly appointed Members of the committee to join in cosponsoring this essential legislation when they have had a chance to consider the proposals which it contains.

I want to make clear that this bill is a vehicle to bring before our committee proposed legislative solutions for some of the problems outstanding in the highway safety field at the present time. In our deliberations, some of these approaches may be changed, modified, or eliminated.

A summary of the provisions contained in the Highway Safety Act of 1973 follows these remarks. As you can deduce from them, this is an ambitious measure, one which I believe has the potential, if

fully funded and implemented, of saving 10,000 lives each year.

I expect the Highway Safety Act of 1973 will be included in the forthcoming highway hearings which the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works will soon initiate. I am hopeful that all of the provisions of the act will be included in the highway bill reported by the Committee on Public Works.

Because of the importance of this legislation for reducing the slaughter on our highways, I urge all Members of Congress to give their support to this measure. It is legislation in the best interests of the Nation and every man, woman, and child who lives here.

The legislative summary follows:

HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1973—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. *Short Title*—Highway Safety Act of 1973

SEC. 102. *Highway Safety*—This section would authorize the appropriation of the following sums out of the Highway Fund for highway safety purposes:

1. For the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—\$200 million for fiscal year 1974 and \$300 million for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out State and local highway safety programs under section 402 of Title 23.

2. For section 403 programs relating to highway safety research and development administered by NHTSA—\$115 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would also be provided.

3. For the Federal Highway Administration—\$35 million for carrying out section 402 programs for fiscal year 1974 and \$45 million for fiscal year 1975.

4. An additional \$10 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be provided for carrying out section 307(a) and 403 of Title 23 by FHWA.

SEC. 103. *Rail Highway Crossings*—Many of the 220,000 public railroad-highway grade crossings in the United States at the present time are poorly marked and/or protected. As a result, 12,000 motor vehicle-train collisions occur which cause 1,500 deaths and 7,000 injuries. This program would seek to provide adequate signing and other protections, including separation and relocation where warranted, to all crossings in this country. \$150 million for fiscal year 1974 and \$225 million for fiscal 1975 would be provided for this purpose, with two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Under this section railroad-highway crossing projects would be authorized both on and off the Federal-aid highway system.

SEC. 104. *Bridge Reconstruction and Replacement*—The need to upgrade and improve our older bridges both on and off the Federal-aid system grows more pressing with each passing year. If progress is to be made in accomplishing this end, a continuing score of funding must be provided for this purpose. To this end, \$225 million would be provided for fiscal year 1974 and \$450 million for fiscal 1975, with two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended out of the Highway Trust Fund. Under this section railroad-highway crossing projects would be authorized both on and off the Federal-aid highway system.

SEC. 105. *Pavement Marking Program*—A \$250 million, two-year program to stripe all roads of the Nation which are presently poorly striped or not marked at all. This program would be specifically targeted at State and county secondary roads in rural areas where two-thirds of all highway fatalities occur.

SEC. 106. *Pavement Marking Research and Demonstration*—A national striping program

would be extremely beneficial and save a great many lives. But the benefits of pavement marking all but disappear during bad weather conditions. In order to learn better how to cope with such conditions, a strong research effort in the field of wet and bad weather marking and delineation is urgently needed. Complemented by follow-on demonstration projects, new techniques and technology could be developed for solving the adverse weather marking problem. \$40 million would be provided for this purpose over a two-year period.

SEC. 107. *Drug Use and Driver Behavior Highway Safety Research*—While a great deal of money is presently being spent on basic research in the alcohol field, very little work has been done insofar as drugs are concerned. Nor is the area of drivers with behavioral problems receiving the attention it deserves. We cannot continue to slight these latter two areas and expect to effectively cope with the highway safety problem. An adequate research foundation must be built. A basic research program should, therefore, be initiated in order to mobilize basic research capabilities at all levels of government and in the private sector. \$40 million would be provided for this purpose over a two-year period.

SEC. 108. *Projects for High Hazard Locations (Spot Improvements)*—As you know, the spot improvements program was deleted from the Highway Act of 1970. This much-needed program for dealing with high hazard locations should be specifically established. A \$100 million annual program divided two-thirds for high hazard locations on the Federal-aid highway system (out of the Highway Trust Fund) and one-third for those off the system (out of the General Fund), would save many lives.

SEC. 109. *Program for Elimination of Roadside Obstacles*—Investigations by the Oversight Subcommittee confirm that roadside obstacles are a major cause of accidents, injuries and deaths on the Nation's highways. By funding a long-range program to eliminate such obstacles, a principal cause of needless deaths and injuries could be eliminated in this decade. To the extent necessary, existing sign and light supports which are not designed to yield or break-away would be replaced. \$75 million annually would be provided for this much-needed effort, two-thirds from the Highway Trust Fund.

SEC. 110. *Highway Safety Educational Programming and Study*—Realistically, the best way to educate and involve the general public is through wide-spread use of mass media. Present media efforts are confined to 30 and 60-second radio and TV spot announcements. Thus far, at least, these have failed to alert, educate or involve the American driving public. We need to study and develop new media methods and techniques for educating and informing the general public in the field of highway safety. To that end, \$1,000,000 would be authorized for a study and assessment of current media efforts and the formulation of recommendations for future programming. An additional \$4,000,000 would be provided for the development of highway safety pilot television messages of varying lengths for future use to educate and inform the general public on driving techniques and proper pedestrian practices.

SEC. 111. *Citizen Participation Study*—If a safety crusade is to succeed, wide citizen involvement and support is absolutely essential. Ways and means for encouraging greater citizen participation in the traffic enforcement process must, therefore, be developed. Citizen involvement could take any of several forms. A Citizen's Traffic Reserve Corps, could, for example, serve as an invaluable adjunct of professional law enforcement organizations to alert traffic authorities about hazards, to report accidents and to perform other valuable safety functions. \$1 million would be authorized for this study.

SEC. 112. *Feasibility Study—National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations*—One of the greatest weaknesses of the present highway safety effort is the lack of specific, up-to-date, comprehensive data to support action programs. Consideration should be given to establishing a national system for uniform reporting of all accidents nationwide. Such a system would provide Federal, State and local authorities with continuous oversight over highway operations. Ultimately, it should be possible to get a clear picture of what is happening on the Nation's highways on a day-to-day basis. A study looking to the feasibility of a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations, the cost of setting up and maintaining it, as well as problems associated with such an undertaking, could prove extremely useful. \$5 million would be authorized for the conduct of such a study.

SEC. 113. *Pedestrian Safety Study*—In 1972, 10,000 pedestrians lost their lives in traffic mishaps. Each year the pedestrian toll rises. While efforts are presently being made to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries, they have not been successful. New ways and means must be found to protect pedestrians, especially children. Accordingly, this section would authorize a full and complete investigation and study of the pedestrian safety problem by the Secretary of Transportation. In its conduct, the cooperation and consultation of other agencies, the States, their political subdivisions and other interested private organizations, groups and individuals would be sought. Results would be reported to the Congress along with legislative recommendations. \$5 million out of the Highway Trust Fund would be authorized for this purpose.

SEC. 114. *Manpower Training and Evaluation Programs*—This provision would authorize section 402 funds appropriated to the States for highway safety programs to be used for the development and implementation of manpower training and demonstration programs which the Secretary determines would help reduce traffic accidents.

SEC. 115. *Public Road Mileage*—For purposes of apportioning section 402 funds among the States, this section would provide that public road mileage in each State would be determined at the end of each calendar year.

SEC. 116. *Minimum Apportionment*—Under this section, the minimum amount available to any State for section 402 highway safety programs would be increased from one-third of 1% to one-half of 1%.

SEC. 117. *Incentives for Compliance with Highway Safety Standards*—This provision would authorize the Secretary to award each year \$10 million in incentive grants to those States which have achieved "above average results" in their highway safety programs. An additional \$10 million would be provided for States which have made the "most significant improvement" in carrying out their programs, with no State receiving more than \$500,000 in any fiscal year. Such sums are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

SEC. 118. *Highway Safety Research and Development*—This section would clarify the language of section 402 so as to make clear that research funds could be used for grants to or contracts with public agencies, institutions and individuals for personnel training, research fellowships, development of accident investigation procedures, emergency service plans, demonstration projects and other related activities deemed by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 119. *Transfer of Demonstration Project Equipment*—This provision would authorize the Secretary to transfer to State and local agencies title to equipment purchased with research funds for demonstration projects.

Sec. 120. *Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Infractions.*—The only contact that many Americans ever have with our court system is in the realm of traffic infractions. Because our traffic courts are overwhelmed and inadequate, many emerge with a jaundiced view of how our courts operate. The feasibility of administrative alternatives to judicial adjudication of traffic infractions should be explored. This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct research in this area looking to the development of fair, efficient and effective administrative processes and procedures. A report to the Congress would be made by July 1, 1975.

Sec. 121. *National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.*—The National Highway Traffic Safety Administrator would be added by this provision as an ex officio member of the National Highway Safety Committee.

Sec. 122. *Date of Annual Report.*—This section would move back the date on which the Secretary is required to submit his annual report to the Congress on the administration of the Highway Safety Act from March 1 to July 1 each year.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The Highway Safety Act of 1973 would authorize the appropriation of approximately \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1974 and \$1.5 billion in fiscal 1975. The primary source of funding would be the Highway Trust Fund.

This level of funding would represent a five fold increase over present levels. Estimates indicate that if such sums are provided and the programs contained in the Highway Safety Act of 1973 are fully implemented, upwards of 10,000 lives will be saved each year, with commensurate reductions in accidents, injuries and property damage.

DEBT REDUCTION BILL

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this Nation cannot continue to give its national debt the Scarlett O'Hara "I'll think about it tomorrow" treatment. We must reverse the present casual disregard this body has toward our debt. For far too long Congress has treated debt retirement like a drunk would treat a hangover—too horrible to contemplate.

I feel that if we treat debt retirement the same as we treat other fixed expenses of the Government, we will make a start on reducing the mountainous obligation. For this reason I have today introduced legislation requiring the President to submit in his annual budget a figure to be used to pay on the debt, that figure to be no less than \$2 billion.

Our national debt is currently \$447 billion and it is expected to be \$465 billion by the end of the year. These may be sums none of us can really comprehend, but that goes directly to the point. It is not really possible to comprehend a debt of that magnitude, yet we are not even making an attempt to reduce this national disgrace.

The wisdom of paying debts when times are good cannot be questioned. However, we have been through business booms and the situation is the same, our national debt increases.

It is time to budget debt retirement like any other fixed Government expense. We cannot avoid this problem any longer.

TWO OUTSTANDING EDUCATORS

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, recently the McCallie School in Chattanooga, Tenn., marked the retirement of two outstanding faculty members following 86 years of untiring service and devotion to the teaching of young men. As a former student at McCallie, I came to know both of these men personally from a student-teacher relationship, and since graduation, I have tried to maintain a close personal friendship with both of them because I feel deeply indebted to both of them for the leadership and guidance they provided me. Those other Members of Congress who attended McCallie will know that I speak of none other than Col. Herbert Pritchard Dunlap and Maj. Arthur Lee Burns. Both of these men joined the staff of McCallie in 1925 and are largely responsible for the high standing it has among preparatory schools.

One of the men, if not the one man, who had the most influence on my life was Maj. Arthur Lee Burns. He was a giant of an individual in every sense of the word. He was stern when the situation called for sternness, but he also exhibited the compassion of a Christian gentleman when one of the students needed the understanding of their "father" away from home. A graduate of McCallie himself, Major Burns returned to his alma mater in 1925 after he received his M.A. degree in French from Emory University. His capacities at McCallie included many, but the ones for which he is best remembered are associate head master, dean of students and vice president.

A graduate of the Citadel, Herbert P. Dunlap came to McCallie in 1925 to teach English and serve as assistant commandant. But he soon found that he had many other duties including the supervision of military drills, athletic coach, and adviser to students. During the years, he also served in many other positions including the director of admissions, development director and head of the military department. At the time of his retirement, Colonel Dunlap was a vice president and business manager of McCallie. In addition to his school duties he also found time to serve one term on the Hamilton County Council and two terms as Chattanooga Commissioner of Fire and Police.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, feel very fortunate to have known Major Burns and Colonel Dunlap. I salute them for what they have meant to the students of McCallie.

NORTH VIETNAM KIDNAPS CHILDREN OF SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, while Americans debate over the shape of a future peace in South Vietnam, the North Vietnamese are laying the groundwork for future subversion. In a story that appeared in London some time ago, and evidently, nowhere in the United States, it is related how the North Vietnamese are systematically kidnapping South Vietnamese children, who are to be indoctrinated for future activity against the South Vietnamese Government.

This atrocity and human tragedy follows a precedent established by the Communists in at least one other conflict. During the period of the Greek Civil Wars, the Communist guerrillas kidnapped or evacuated approximately 28,000 children. The international Red Cross records in Geneva show that there were 6,000 requests from Greek parents for 8,500 children. Significantly, on March 3, 1948 the Balkan Youth Conference made a decision that 3- to 14-year-olds in "Free Greece" should be taken away and cared for in Cominform countries. Evidently, the Communist nations had a definite purpose in mind at that time also. In November 1948, the United Nations called for the return of these children, but only Yugoslavia cooperated.

Those persons who feel we may be entering an era of peace in Vietnam had better take heed of North Vietnam's long-range plans. Therefore, I commend the attention of my colleagues to this article from the Daily Telegraph of London of November 7, 1972 which follows:

MASS KIDNAP OF CHILDREN TO FORM FIFTH COLUMN

(By Ian Ward)

North Vietnamese soldiers are kidnapping South Vietnamese children by the hundred and trekking them through dangerous jungle trails to indoctrination schools in the North.

Details are given in a lengthy American Government memorandum. The Communists aim is to create a fifth column, to be sent South in a few years.

The nature of the programme is regarded by experts on Communist methods as a graphic illustration of Hanoi's long-range intentions.

The memorandum refers specifically to three districts in northern Binh Din Province which came under Communist control for three months earlier this year. It estimates that more than 1,700 children have been kidnapped from these areas, Tam Quan, Hoai An and Hoai Nhon.

SIX-YEAR-OLDS

Ages of those spirited away range from six to 12. Children of over 12 have been forced into local guerilla units.

Records show similar abduction efforts in the past, but never before have so many children been wrenched from their homes at one time.

The American document says that Communist agents use threats and coercion when

parents resist requests to "volunteer" their children. It quotes interviews with parents.

On the trail northwards, the children are subjected to lectures on discipline and sessions of self-criticism, the memorandum says.

It refers to nine eye-witness accounts from which experts have been able to identify different groups, varying in size and travelling at different times.

These details refer to more than 600 children seen on the trail.

The numbers of children kidnapped from the Binh Dinh Province area is estimated as Tam Quan 918, Hoai An 596, Hoai Nhon 200.

CHILDREN OF OFFICIALS

It is known that the Communists prefer to seize the children of government officials or of those who work in the outlying districts.

In this way they seek to swell the ranks of their future fifth column and to retain a long-range blackmail weapon with which to manipulate members of South Vietnam's rural administrative service.

The United States memorandum sets out four reasons for the abductions:

1—It coincides with the Communists long-range plans for training "high motivation" cadres for the future.

2—It gives the Communists a leverage with families who would otherwise be committed to the Government side.

3—It offers the opportunity for creating dissension and suspicion at family level once the children return, thereby sowing the seeds for alienation of the Government by the people.

4—The programme is in keeping with North Vietnam systematic efforts to break up the age-old Vietnamese custom of strong family ties.

OTHER ABDUCTIONS FEARED

South Vietnamese officials fear that the abduction of children that has come to light in Binh Dinh province may have been repeated in several other areas that have come under lengthy Communist domination during the present offensive.

If this is so, the document concludes, the programme will pose a problem of considerable proportions for South Vietnam in the future.

As far as the Government is concerned, preparations are being made to raise the issue of child abduction at any international conference that might follow a ceasefire.

TRIBUTE TO OLIVER P. BOLTON

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that we take note of the passing of the Honorable Oliver Payne Bolton, who served with distinction for three terms as a Member of the House of Representatives.

He came to Congress with a rich heritage in Government from his parents: His father, Chester Castle Bolton, who served in the House during the 71st, 72d, 73d, 74th, and 76th sessions; and his mother, Frances Payne Bolton, who was elected to fill a vacancy in the 76th Congress following the death of her beloved husband. Mrs. Bolton was elected to 14 successive terms in the House of Representatives.

Oliver Payne Bolton, in addition to his service in the legislative branch of the Government, distinguished himself by overseas military service during World War II. As a lawyer and newspaper publisher in Ohio, Mr. Bolton had received recognition in private life through the same sincere devotion to his professions, as he had given to the responsibilities that are imposed upon a Member of Congress.

In closing, may we all extend to his family and associates our sincere sympathy over this great loss that had come to the State of Ohio and the Nation.

PEACE WITH HONOR, NOTHING MORE AND NOTHING LESS

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, amid all of our hopes and prayers for peace in Vietnam, a rancorous—and profoundly dangerous—sound is now being heard. Some of our most respected leaders are saying that the recent bombing of military targets in Hanoi and Haiphong accomplished nothing. They say we added only to the numbers of POW's, MIA's and KIA's—even that we perhaps made the North Vietnamese more determined.

Well—before the bombing, the North Vietnamese were not negotiating and the Paris peace talks had broken down. After the bombing, the North Vietnamese came back to negotiate and the Paris peace talks moved ahead.

We have eyes and we can see. We have minds and we can understand.

But it is even more important to analyze this rancorous new criticism of the President—because we seek not only peace in Vietnam—but a new generation of peace everywhere in the world. And the critics clearly—and fundamentally—believe that the judicious use of military power has no place in the conduct of foreign policy. Theirs is indeed the voice of appeasement.

When President Nixon conducted limited operations into Cambodia and Laos, the critics accused him of waging ruthless, aggressive war. They charged he was setting back the chances of peace. But President Nixon said his attacks against enemy sanctuaries would cut down the enemy's fighting power and make it possible to speed up the withdrawal of our GI's.

President Nixon was proven right. Even before the recent phases of the Paris peace talks, he had succeeded in cutting down our authorized troop strength in Vietnam from 550,000 to 29,000. The critics were proven wrong.

When President Nixon made his fateful May 8 decision to mine the Haiphong Harbor and resume the bombing of North Vietnam, the critics once again were horrified and conscience stricken. They said he was jeopardizing the chances of success at the Moscow Summit soon to follow. But the Moscow Summit was not only a success—it was the occasion for

the signing of the SALT I agreement that heralded the worldwide generation of peace.

The success of the Moscow Summit proved once again the truth of Sir Winston Churchill's belief that:

There is nothing the Russians admire so much as strength and nothing for which they have less respect than weakness. We cannot afford to work on narrow margins, offering temptations for a trial of strength.

And, once again, the men of appeasement were proven wrong.

Durini th recent election campaign, with Vietnam the No. 1 issue, the voters of America were heard from. They overwhelmingly endorsed the President—and since then, according to the polls, they support the bombing of military targets to put a speedier end to the war.

President Nixon now deserves the chance to win peace in Vietnam—in the new negotiations that the sacrifices of our airmen have made possible. The men of appeasement—by contrast—have a vested interest in the failure of any kind of peace that rests on power.

Many critics want peace with surrender.

President Nixon will accept only peace with honor—nothing more, and nothing less.

DO NOT DISMANTLE EDA

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that President Nixon, in contemptuous disregard of the express will of Congress, plans to scuttle the Economic Development Administration and all its programs on which thousands of depressed communities across the Nation are depending for their survival.

I have been informed by highly reliable sources—and the White House has not denied their accuracy—that the Office of Management and Budget has slashed the EDA budget for the next year from \$367 million to something in the neighborhood of \$20 million.

Twenty million dollars. Mr. Speaker, that is about what will be spent here in Washington this weekend to celebrate Mr. Nixon's second inauguration. It is just about enough to cover severance pay for the dedicated men and women who staff the EDA programs throughout the country and who now see their efforts canceled by a stroke of the White House pen.

The President has fired his EDA Administrator, Bob Podesta, one of the ablest Federal officials I have encountered in all my 26 years in Congress. He has served notice on the more than 1,100 counties designated for EDA assistance that they can take care of their own jobless citizens or cut them adrift.

If this ill-considered Presidential decision is not countermanded by the Congress, all our hopes for the economic revival of these hard-pressed areas will go down the drain.

Accordingly, with the bipartisan sup-

port of both Republican and Democratic members of the House Public Works Committee, I have today introduced legislation to continue the EDA programs and the Regional Planning Commissions for 1 year at their present funding levels.

We are proposing a 1-year extension because that is the time needed to complete studies now underway by the House and Senate into the operation of these programs. The additional year is needed, furthermore, to allow for an orderly transition to new programs if better ways are found to relieve economic hardship and unemployment in our depressed communities.

Last October, we passed legislation which would have improved and extended the EDA and Regional Commission programs. The President saw fit to veto that bill in the closing weeks of the 92d Congress when no time was left for reconsideration by its supporters in the House and Senate—a solid bipartisan majority of the Congress, by the way.

Now, in the opening days of the 93d Congress, the President proposes to dismantle EDA and a whole array of programs initiated by the Congress many years ago and continued year after year for one simple reason—they were effective, they were bringing industry, jobs, and hope to American communities that were sadly short of all three commodities.

The right of Congress to reflect the public will by legislating in the public interest has once again been challenged by the Executive. We intend to meet that challenge.

The House Public Works Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has made the economic development programs its No. 1 priority as of today. And I am confident that the entire Congress will stand with us in defense of its role in the Government of these United States.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT M. BALL

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, is leaving the post he has held since 1962.

Although all of us dislike bureaucracies, we find, to our chagrin, that the very immensity and diversity of our society aids the growth of bureaucracy in both Government and the private sector.

Robert Ball hated bureaucracy, too, but he was a man who not only knew how to run a bureaucracy as efficiently as possible, but also how to make it as compassionate and humane as possible. This combination of qualities is rare indeed and we in the Congress will surely miss him.

Robert Ball was instrumental in the difficult reorganization of the vast social security apparatus with one object in mind: to better serve the aged, the widowed and the helpless. And he was suc-

cessful—as successful as one man can be in the desolate world of offices and paperwork.

Robert Ball's service with Social Security can be summarized in two words: He cared. It is for this most important of reasons that I say I am sorry to see him leave—and I extend to him my very best wishes for good health, happiness, and success in his future endeavors.

SYMMS LAUDS REMARKS BY LEO BODINE

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to introduce a statement into the RECORD made by Mr. Leo Bodine, executive vice president of Associated Industries of Idaho. This statement discusses the relationship between freedom and government control, and poses the question of whether more government or less government is what we need to produce the best future for our land and its people.

For centuries, man has struggled with the problems of poverty and injustice. Countless systems of economics and political organization have been tried with varying degrees of success. The United States has been an experiment based on the idea that free men with the right to own their own property, and the right to keep most of what they earn would be the most creative and productive. The experiment has had astonishing success. No nation on earth has done more to abolish poverty. No nation in history has given hope and opportunity to so many people. It is not a perfect system, but before we destroy it with overregulation, and crippling taxation, we should remember that political and economic freedom has been the main-spring of human progress. This Nation's future can be even greater than her past, if only we have the wisdom to limit the size of government and to encourage greater individual opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bodine's remarks follow and I commend them to the reading of my colleagues:

MR. BODINE'S REMARKS

Each of us and all of us share a high regard for this rugged, beautiful land called Idaho. Each of us and all of us wish it a great future. We may not agree, in fact it would be a first in the history of human behavior if we did, as to how best that future can be attained.

Simple observation, however, reveals many things about which there can be little disagreement . . . relatively, Idaho is still sparsely populated, distant from markets and short the number of industrial units necessary for the creation of wealth . . . and this latter statement does not in any sense downgrade the importance of Idaho agriculture. Development, except for agriculture, lumber, and mining, has set no records in Idaho. It has been slow, perhaps fortunately so . . . but the state seems now to be on the threshold of an accelerating growth that can bring many desirables and also produce some annoying growth pains.

Generally conceded, except by those who would make a federal province of Idaho and set aside its lands for non-development, is the advisability of balanced growth . . . industry, agriculture, mining, recreation—and in general the normal mix of man's interests.

If balanced growth is to occur, and it will not come about accidentally, a necessary requisite will be attraction of additional industry, diverse in category . . . plus continuation of existing industry under circumstances favorable enough to permit both continuance and orderly growth.

There are many things that attract or repel industry. In some instances the availability of a work force . . . in others, distance from market . . . in yet others the cost of raw material . . . and always the cost of government. So the record of government behavior is important and this is the only clue available as to what the future may bring from that cost center. It is easy to deal with knowns . . . the unknowns and the unexpected are what drives management up the wall and gets a company into difficulties . . . and government at its various levels has produced more sudden, expensive additions to manufacturing costs than all other unpredictable combined.

It is through government that non-admirers of the capitalistic system attack. Their favorite and most telling weapon is government spending and the taxes that must be assessed to cover, or the alternative, deficits accepted with attendant inflation.

If we insist on increasing the role of government in our lives and affairs, higher taxes are unavoidable. Paternalism must be paid for. Mr. Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve has said "The propensity to spend more than we are prepared to finance through taxes is becoming deep seated and ominous."

Casper Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has warned of an ominous fiscal future unless the Congress stops financing governmental schemes by inflationary processes. He says "Throwing money at social problems is not the way to solve them."

If Treasury deficits and disastrous inflation are to be avoided, government expenditures must be met by taxation, in the interest of sound fiscal and monetary policies.

Economic controls have not and will not cure inflation.

One school of political thought has announced that we are "committed to resuming the march to equality", which is to be brought about by a redistribution of power, income and property.

Perhaps an astute Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, did speak the truth of us, when he said "Americans are so enamored of equality they would rather be equal in slavery than unequal in freedom."

This is not to deny that government must change to fit the needs of its citizenry. Our governments have changed radically in the less than 200 years of this nation's life. Actually, we have one of the oldest continuous governments on earth and its ability to change . . . rapidly, repeatedly and with a minimum of frictions . . . to meet the needs of successive generations of Americans . . . is no doubt principally accountable for its longevity.

The government which sufficed for my grandparents would not suffice today. Their requirements were those of venturesome travelers, moving westward from Minnesota to Kansas to Utah to Oregon and then to Idaho, via covered wagon.

My grandfather was a blacksmith . . . a self-reliant, proud man who very nearly perished of exposure during a bad winter in Provo City, Utah, and took it in stride . . . as did other families in the same group.

My grandfather would not have guessed that his great grandchildren would live in

houses with several television sets and talk learnedly of prospective trips to the planets . . . of bouncing communicating waves from orbiting satellites or of farming and mining the ocean's depths. He would have found computers totally unbelievable . . . and it would have been unthinkable that government should identify poverty, control of air and water, racial discrimination, employment, and a host of other things as proper concerns of government . . . to be solved by government.

Times do change . . . rapidly . . . and the role of government has changed as markedly and as rapidly as has anything else . . . it has mushroomed into a size that defies comprehension and it reaches into every life, every hour, every day.

It is time to read history. The study of civilizations teaches that expanding democracy often ends in destroying the earlier institutions of liberty. The greater the attempts at social and economic equality the dimmer the prospects for liberty.

It was Woodrow Wilson who cautioned . . . "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

In the final analysis, the political, economic and social issue that supersedes all others is Private Capitalism vs Socialism.

We will be hard pressed to preserve our system if excessive taxation is allowed to siphon off incomes and property otherwise available for meeting living costs and for investment in private capitalistic enterprises. Excessive taxation stunts production and economic growth.

No nation can exist in the modern world without a strong and viable economy. It is time we stop derogating private wealth, property rights, business success, profits and economic power . . . if we are to preserve individual liberty, free enterprise and private capitalism . . . the exact things which account for all our successes and all our triumphs.

The absolute height of all ironies is revealed when the chronicle of industrial accomplishments in this country is held side by side with the record of attacks made upon industry.

Industry has been the single most responsible element of our society. It has accepted each new burden placed upon it, made the necessary adjustments, and played a major, if not the major, role in advancing this country to its position of eminence in today's world.

The accomplishments, in total, seemingly, have generated a belief that there is no limit to what industry can do . . . and that may be very nearly so—if the regulatory chains are not drawn too tight, too fast, and the requirements are not made so severe that increased prices thus made necessary . . . bring revolt and rejection in the market place . . . in precisely the fashion that excessive taxes at this unknown point will bring a taxpayer revolt.

Happily, Idaho as a state does not indulge, as does the Federal establishment the temptation to overspend and accept deficits, and the record for constancy and reasonable consistency in its governmental processes has been reasonably good . . . but, here as elsewhere the disposition to tax and tax and spend and spend has not proven entirely irresistible.

Educational outlays are illustrative. There is neither time, nor disposition on my part to argue whether or not we are getting acceptable value from these very sizable expenditures. My fear, frankly, is that the people who may be the best qualified to solve the riddle, the educators themselves, have not taken its true measure although it is heartening to note the disposition of some leading educators to critically examine aspects of the problem that have long been considered "untouchable". Certainly it will not long be

enough to rely upon fiercely articulated annual request for more funds to solve educational difficulties.

And speaking of competition . . . it really peaks out in the battle between state agencies for building funds.

Governments have changed and can be changed again. I believe we are entering a period of change . . . at the Federal level at least. The past eight years could be described as the era of government activism. New national problems were discovered and defined at an unprecedented rate—poverty, educational deficiencies, deterioration of the environment, consumer protection, medical care, occupational safety, income maintenance, and others. In each case as the problem was discovered, it was taken for granted that a new government program for dealing with it was necessary.

This era of activism, I hope and believe, is coming to an end . . . it will not occur immediately, such movements never terminate abruptly, but gradually over the next several years. A mood of confidence in government's ability to solve all problems dies hard, but the psychological basis is being laid for an era of greater realism in the conduct of national affairs and after eight years people are more disposed to ask, not merely what has been spent on social programs, but what they have accomplished. And the answer in most cases has to be "not much".

Encouraging also is President Nixon's declaration that during his second term he intends to break the trend toward ever-growing big and bigger government . . . to cut back, to reorganize, and to reduce spending.

Encouraging, too, here at home, Idaho voters, on November 7, unmistakably declared their belief that restructuring of State government should be undertaken. More importantly, they voted for economy. There is nothing magical in the number 20 . . . who cares a damn whether there are 20 or 25 or 30 departments of State government. What we do care about is the cost of government . . . we want it reduced . . . and not just at the State level . . . as witness the election of apple-biting Steve Symms . . . and I wish him long teeth and much happy biting.

My concluding line is simply that the worth of the inseparable desirables of individual liberty, free enterprise and private capitalism is self-evident and surely a point on which we can all agree. I hope we can also agree that whatever is necessary to preserve them shall be done.

**JIM SMITH, ADMINISTRATOR,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, LEAVES**

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as Jim Smith of Oklahoma leaves Washington and his post as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, his friends and colleagues have every reason to be proud of him and to honor him with our gratitude.

Under his capable leadership, the FHA has expanded and grown and has made creative strides in the service to the rural areas across this Nation. The dedication and energy Jim Smith displayed over the years will be gratefully remembered by the many citizens he served so well.

All of the Members of Congress join to wish Jim Smith and his family suc-

cess and happiness in their future endeavors. We extend a hearty "thank you" to a great public servant and a fine gentleman.

KIEFFER MARSHALL OF TEXAS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Marine Corps held a memorial service here in Washington honoring the heroes of Iwo Jima. The honorees included survivors from the great Iwo Jima Monument. The corps also picked out five marines who had been in the middle of other Iwo combat. One of these men selected was Kieffer Marshall of Bell County, Tex. They chose Kieffer to represent the finest traditions of the Marine Corps as exemplified in Iwo Jima.

This past weekend, I visited with Kieffer Marshall and his wife, Sammie. They were attending a national convention of the Fidelity Union Life Insurance Co. which included the sales leaders from coast to coast. When I saw Kieffer, I thought about the Marine Corps slogan. The marines plainly state they do not want all of the men, they just want the best.

The time has passed quickly as I head into my fourth term in Congress. Prior to this I was a businessman all of my life, and for 25 years, I was with Fidelity Union Life Insurance Co. It was great to see old friends and to recall a vivid memorable experience I had with Kieffer Marshall.

When Kieffer came home from the war, he went to the University of Texas and graduated. He married his beautiful college sweetheart, Sammie, and they settled in Temple, Tex. He entered business with Fidelity Union Life, and I knew him from the first day that he started on his career. He was a hard worker. He was a thorough student. He was consistent week after week. Kieffer was the leading rookie in the company. He soon ranked among the company's top 12 salesmen. In a few years he became the top leader in the entire company. He sold quality business and he maintained quality service.

After about 10 years in the business, his steady progress gained him recognition as the outstanding insurance man in central Texas. I was president of the company when Kieffer called one day. The conversation went something like this:

Jim, I have been contacted by the President of a large new insurance company. He has talked to me several times and has made me an astounding offer. He wants me to be the vice president of their agency sales operation. He said I can continue to live in Temple, and that he will furnish a general office, all of the maintenance and salaries, an automobile, and pay all of my expenses in every way. In addition, he will pay me a \$40,000 salary, he will give me all of my own commissions plus renewals on my sales. He will give me a big percentage on all sales made by any agent in our entire operation. What do you think?

I had heard of a lot of offers that were being made but this was the jumbo

proposition of all. Here was a 10-year basic contract with unlimited renewals. This was a \$100,000 a year deal for a young man in a small community. Here was a company that had been formed with a tremendous paid-in capital. I never heard of such an offer being made before to a man in the field.

After thinking it over, I called Kieffer back and told him that there was no way any company could live with such a fantastic contract. I said, "He is giving you all of this conversation, but you have only heard it from the president of the company." I know it is not possible, so would Kieffer have the president go to the board of directors and get the entire proposal confirmed and approved by the board of directors of the company.

About 2 weeks later, I had a call from Kieffer. He said that he had received from the president a statement covering all of this. He sent a certified copy of the written minutes of the board of directors meeting where they had covered every point, in every way, and had guaranteed it all specifically. Kieffer asked what did I suggest.

I thought and I thought, but I had nothing to add, and I had nothing to suggest. I just told Kieffer that he would have to make the decision by himself. Kieffer said that he was going to talk it all over with Sammie and that he would let me know.

The days rolled by and Kieffer called back. As I recall, it went something like this:

Jim, Sammie and I have been doing a lot of talking and thinking. We have reviewed this offer over and over, as it is such a staggering amount for a young couple. We prayed over it. And I guess Sammie summed it up the best when she said, "What this offer really boils down to is this—they want to buy your name, Kieffer, because you have built a real good name. And for this, they are willing to pay a real high price. But Kieffer, there is no price high enough to pay for a good name." And that is the way we feel about it, Jim. My name is not for sale.

Kieffer continued to establish sales records for the Fidelity Union Co. He continued to be a hard working citizen and took pride in being on the team of every community drive that built for a better Temple and Bell County.

I resigned as president of Fidelity Union Life when I went into politics. The years get by mighty fast. It was such a warm feeling when Dee and I got to visit with the Marshalls this weekend. I remembered back when he had this tremendous offer. I recall that 3 years after that company got started, that it ended up a financial failure because they tried to find an easy way to do business.

But Kieffer Marshall has continued from that day forward to do a good day's work every day, day in and day out. I learned that he now has \$27 million of life insurance in force right there in the small community of Bell County, Tex. And Kieffer and Sammie are still young with the future ahead of them.

From time to time, I find young men who have just entered the field of business. They are looking for shortcuts. They are looking for the quickest way to get rich. I think that usually we find

that the hardest way in the long run might be the best.

The Marine Corps is proud of its fine sons. Texas is proud to see its young men carry on the traditions that built our State from the days of the Alamo and San Jacinto. And the city of Temple down in Bell County in the heart of Texas will always be proud of the Kieffer Marshalls.

JUSTICE RAYMOND E. PETERS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, Justice Raymond E. Peters, associate justice of the California Supreme Court, died a few weeks ago. Justice Peters was recognized as one of the great members of the bench, not only in California, but throughout the Nation.

I would like to have a tribute to Justice Peters placed in the Record. The tribute was written by my constituent, Joel Zeldin, member of the California Bar and former law clerk to Chief Justice Donald R. Wright of the California Supreme Court:

JUSTICE RAYMOND E. PETERS

Justice Raymond E. Peters, Associate Justice of the California Supreme Court, died two weeks ago—during the week he was to announce his retirement. He was 69 years old.

Justice Peters was a native of Oakland, California. He attended Boalt Hall law school at the University of California, earning his support as an automobile mechanic and graduating with the highest honors awarded. Following several years of public and private legal practice, he was appointed to the Court of Appeal, where he served for 20 years. In 1959, Governor Edmund Brown selected him to fill a vacant seat on the state's high bench.

During his 13 years with the Supreme Court, Justice Peters wrote numerous precedent-setting opinions, many of which departed from outdated but accepted principles in order to achieve a fairer result.

For example, in 1967, the Los Angeles Teachers' Union filed suit to challenge a Board of Education rule which forbade teachers from circulating and discussing petitions while on school grounds, even during lunch periods when the teachers had no duties. School authorities argued that such discussions might have a disruptive effect on school related activities. (Incidentally, the petition about which the controversy arose entreated the governor and the state superintendent of public instruction not to implement a threatened cutback in state funding for public schools.) In holding the restrictions on free speech unconstitutional, Justice Peters wrote for a unanimous court:

"Harmony among public employees is undoubtedly a legitimate governmental objective as a general proposition . . . ; however, . . . government has no interest in preventing the sort of disharmony which inevitably results from the mere expression of controversial ideas. . . . It cannot seriously be argued that school officials may demand a teaching faculty composed either of unthinking 'yes men' who will uniformly adhere to a designated side of any controversial issue or of thinking individuals sworn never to share their ideas with one another for fear

they may disagree and, like children, extend their disagreement to the level of general hostility and uncooperativeness. Yet it is precisely the inevitable disharmony resulting from the clash of opposing viewpoints that [the school board] admittedly [seeks] to avoid in the present case." (Los Angeles Teachers' Union v. Los Angeles City Board of Education (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 551.)

Then, in 1971, a bar owner challenged the constitutionality of a statute which prohibited women, except holders of liquor licenses and wives of holders, from tending bar. On behalf of a unanimous court, Justice Peters held that the law was violative of the equal protection clauses of both the federal and state constitutions, as he eloquently wrote:

"The desire to protect women from the general hazards inherent in many occupations cannot be a valid ground for excluding them from those occupations. . . . Such tender and chivalrous concern for the well-being of the female half of the adult population cannot be translated into legal restrictions on employment opportunities for women. . . . The pedestal upon which women have been placed has all too often upon closer inspection been revealed as a cage." (Sall'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1.)

More recently, the court was confronted with the issue of whether prison officials could read written communications between prisoners and their attorneys. Again expressing the views of a unanimous court, Justice Peters said that although prison guards could employ reasonable means of insuring that no physical contraband was being transferred in letters between inmates and their legal counsel, such communications are statutorily privileged and may not be read. (In re Grady and Jordan. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 930.)

But not all of Justice Peters' opinions were unanimous; in fact, his words were often written in dissent. In 1963, the California Supreme Court held that a pregnant mother could not recover damages for mental distress with consequent physical manifestations suffered upon seeing her infant son negligently run over by an ice truck. Justice Peters passionately dissented from this result. He argued that a mother who helplessly watches as her child is crushed will predictably suffer injuries for which she should be compensated, just as others who suffer negligently caused injury are compensated. (Amaya v. Home Ice, Fuel and Supply Co. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 295.) Five years later, that case was overruled, and the position advocated by Justice Peters was followed. (Dillon v. Legg (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 728.)

Though there were other issues on which a Peters dissenting view ultimately appeared in a majority opinion, no such situation is as noteworthy as his fight against capital punishment. For years, Justice Peters consistently voted against imposition of the death penalty and against the death penalty itself. Finally, last year, capital punishment was declared to violate the state constitution's proscription against cruel or unusual punishment. (People v. Anderson (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 628.) Likewise, the federal high court has now banned the death penalty—at least as it is presently imposed. (Furman v. Georgia (1972) 408 U.S. 238.)

As happens with any prominent person who dares suggest unorthodox solution to social problems, some say that Justice Peters was an unrealistic idealist. Others protest, insisting that he was a genius who saw years ahead of his time. But those who have read his opinions or heard his comments at oral argument agree: Justice Peters was the rare man who befriended the unfortunate and defended the downtrodden. His compassionate and forgiving nature made him more than just another successful man, for he was a great man.

The words of Chief Justice Wright articulate the thoughts we all share: "Ray

Peters . . . was a man of strong convictions and his published opinions eloquently speak of his continuing concern for the underprivileged, for the poor, the weak and the despised. Few judges have expressed more clearly an abiding concern for the welfare of his fellow-man. Few judges have fought more vigorously and successfully to secure justice for those who were litigants before the lower courts of our state—and this was especially true of those who were accused of crime. He constantly reminded us that we were a 'court of justice' and that it was our solemn obligation to see that justice was done."

Justice Peters is survived by his wife Marion and his daughter Janet Garrison.

NEWSMAN OPPOSES "SHIELD LAW"

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been quite an uproar over alleged violations of "freedom of the press" when reporters who refused to divulge their news sources have been convicted of contempt of court. As a result of these incidents there have been proposals both in Congress and in State legislatures for "shield laws" to protect newsmen from prosecution. Because there are so many questions still unanswered, however—such as who would be considered a reporter—it seems hasty at this time to promote legislation that would give any special privilege when it comes to withholding evidence in a court of law. The only reservation should be that the prosecutor use every available means to obtain evidence before requiring a newsman to divulge his confidential sources.

In a recent editorial, Mr. Gene Gisley, editor of the Bremerton, Wash., Sun, also questioned the need for these "shield" laws, at least until the press can tell how much effect the new ground rules will have on news reporting. As Mr. Gisley is a working newsman with firsthand knowledge of the problems facing reporters, I think the editorial brings out some interesting and thought-provoking points:

PROTECTION NOT NEEDED?

One of the topics you're going to hear a lot about in the next few months is the "shield law," the device which newsmen are promoting to protect themselves from being compelled to disclose the sources of their information.

If the polls are to be believed, about two-thirds of the general public is in favor of some kind of shield law for newsmen and I think just about all newsmen favor legal protection from disclosure.

Measures to provide that protection have been introduced in the Congress and in many state legislatures. It will be an issue in the Washington Legislature next month.

What follows here may be a little different kind of discussion from most you'll see because I am not sold on the shield law. Most of the writing on the shield law comes from journalists and I am suspicious of the ability of newsmen to be objective—as I am of the members of any other group—when their personal interests seem to be at stake. When they are personally threatened, newsmen are as quick to abandon reason as anyone else.

A newsman may be an ardent advocate of

stern handling of unruly crowds, for instance; but let him get roughed up once in a mob by a police officer and he'll turn into an instant cop-hater. I've seen it happen; it's happened to me.

The shield law matter is not that dramatic a confrontation, of course, but it seems so to those newsmen who are being thrown into jail on contempt charges for refusing to divulge their sources of information desired by grand juries or the courts.

My reservations about shield laws are not the conventional ones. They do not seem to me, as they seem to some, to function as a bar to the pursuit of libel in the courts. One of the defenses against libel is to establish the truth of the published material. If it were necessary to reveal sources of information to do that, I think sources would be identified. It seems unlikely to me that newsmen would feel so principled about identifying sources as a protection from libel as they feel in divulging similar information to a grand jury investigating crime.

Neither do I think that extending confidentiality to newsmen would be any particular handicap to the functioning of government or the administration of justice. There already are so many forms of confidentiality established by law and practice that I cannot see how one more would make any difference, especially considering the infrequency with which it becomes an issue.

There is, by way of example, the confidentiality between a lawyer and his client, between a pastor and penitent, between husband and wife, and, to a lesser degree, perhaps, between a physician and his patient. And though it is not exactly a case of confidentiality, all members of Congress may make any remark they care to make on the floor of Congress, citing sources or not as they wish, and they may never be questioned in any other place for those remarks. That is a protection of the Constitution.

My reservations about the shield law concern the difficulty of determining whom it would apply to, the need for it, and the constitutionality of it.

It is simple to determine who is an attorney because lawyers are admitted to the bar, or who is a physician because doctors have medical degrees, or who is a congressman because they all are elected.

But who deserves the privileges accorded a newsman? Is it only a person with a press card signed by the editor of a metropolitan daily newspaper? Is it the college or high school student writing for his school's publication? Is it a scroungy militant writing for some scurrilous underground press? Is it a legislator publishing a newsletter for constituents? I don't think anybody can define useful limitations on what a newsman is, or what "newsgathering" is; at least I can't.

Even if you could decide to whom the shield law's privileges would apply, I am not certain that its protections are so necessary as is generally thought. In a fairly long career of newspapering, I cannot recall a single story which has gone unpublished because of my apprehension that I might later be called upon to divulge the source of the information. I might have refused to disclose my informants a time or two if I had been asked to do so; but I can't remember suffering prior restraint in that prospect.

Absence of a shield law does not mean that a newsman necessarily will go to jail; it may mean only that he will decide not to write a certain story if his commitment to its confidentiality would require his going to jail.

Newsmen know all manner of information which is never published, even though its publication might be useful both to the newspaper and to the public. These stories are withheld for a variety of reasons having nothing to do with the fear of being compelled to disclose sources.

My basic objection to a shield law, however, has nothing to do with any of this. It relates to my conviction that the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution means what it says; that is, that the Congress may make no law abridging freedom of speech or of the press. That seems to me to make freedom of the press an absolute; if we seek to write laws defining press freedoms in order to guarantee them, what will be our defense when someone else seeks to write other laws defining press freedoms in order to restrict them?

I realize the changing nature of this question: that the U.S. Supreme Court has taken away a privilege most of us assumed we possessed from the Bill of Rights and that news reporting is entering new and difficult areas.

I have some apprehension that practicality eventually may demand something more concrete in defense of freedom of the press than an unshared faith in the Constitution.

But I think we ought not hurry to write new laws every time we disagree with the Supreme Court. And I think we ought to delay consideration of laws attempting to define press freedoms at least until we can have a clearer idea of the finality of judicial opinion on the issue and until we can tell how much effect the new ground rules will have on the reporting of news.

TRIBUTE TO A TEACHER

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my perceptive young constituent, Neil Larsen, of Sanger, Calif., and his fellow students at Sanger High School, I am inserting a letter received from him which is heartwarming to those of us who know our country's future will be in capable hands.

While doom-and-gloom prophets are busily engaged in deploring the state of today's school age youth, here is refreshing evidence of the awareness of the great majority of our high school students and their appreciation for one who is effectively teaching them about our wonderful system of government.

I salute Neil, Mr. Kenneth Marcan-tonio, and all of his classmates.

Following is the letter:

SANGER, CALIF.,
January 9, 1973.

HON. B. F. SISK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student at Sanger High School in Sanger, California, and am currently enrolled in an American Institutions and Ideals class. We are presently studying about the United States Congress and learning a great deal about its members and their powers.

One of the powers that particularly interested me was your power to insert items into the Congressional Record. I read that Representative Thomas Ashley at one time inserted congratulations to the Whitmer High School debate team, and this gave me the idea to write to you. It would give me and my fellow students great gratification to read a personalized item such as this and also let us know that you think enough about us to do this.

I feel my American Institutions and Ideals teacher is doing an outstanding job, and it was because of his class that I knew enough

to and got the courage to write this letter. Therefore, could you insert something to the effect that our teacher, Mr. Kenneth Marcantonio, is doing a commendable job in acquainting his students with the fundamentals of the American Congressional System.

I realize that the copy of the Congressional Record containing this would cost 25¢ so I am enclosing that amount. I might add also that in February of this year I will be 18 and will join the rest of my family in being a strong Democratic supporter.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

NEIL LARSEN.

ABSOLUTE POWER CORRUPTS ABSOLUTELY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an essay of bone-chilling accuracy by the outstanding correspondent and historian, William L. Shirer. The essay appears in the Nation's January 22, 1973, edition.

In his comparative analysis of Nazi Germany and the United States under Richard Nixon, Mr. Shirer asks, "Has Nixon shown that you don't need a totalitarian dictatorship like Hitler's to get by with murder, that you can do it in a democracy as long as the Congress and the people Congress is supposed to represent don't give a damn?"

I commend this profound article to every Member of Congress:

THE HUBRIS OF A PRESIDENT

(By William L. Shirer)

Though Richard Nixon does not have the dictatorial power of Adolf Hitler—at least, not yet—he has shown in Vietnam that he has the awesome means, unrestrained by any hand, and the disposition to be just as savage in his determination to massacre and destroy the innocent people of any small nation which refuses to bow to his dictates and which is powerless to retaliate.

And apparently the majority of the American people, like the Germans under Hitler, couldn't care less. While Nixon was celebrating the festivities of the Prince of Peace by his reckless, bloody, paranoiac bombing of Hanoi, our God-fearing citizens were preoccupied with the Washington Redskins and the Miami Dolphins fighting their way to the Super Bowl, and seemed unmoved by the barbarism of their President and its horrible consequences for his victims.

I lived through a similar barbarism in Germany, when Hitler unleashed his terror bombing to force certain foreign peoples to do his bidding. I never thought it could happen here at home—even under a Nixon. No one of any consequence in Nazi Germany publicly protested, but at least the Germans had some excuse. To have spoken out might have cost a man his head—or at the very least the horrors of a concentration camp. But no American, watching the results of this President's violence over the Christmas holidays, viewing on his TV tube the shattered hospital in Hanoi, reading in his newspaper of the devastation Nixon was unleashing on the homes and streets of peaceful citizens, could have been restrained by such fears.

Yet, who, at no personal risk, denounced the monstrous crime? Not a single official

in government, very few in the Congress, a few from labor and no one from big business, and not one notable churchman, Protestant or Catholic. There was not a peep from the President's friends among the clergy: no sound from the Rev. Billy Graham, the Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, or Cardinal Cooke (not even after the Pope had raised his voice against the bombing).

Perhaps this unconcern is due in part to the peculiar luck of Americans. Unlike the inhabitants of every other major country and scores of small ones, we have never been bombed, and hence cannot feel in our own flesh and minds the sufferings of those on whom our President wreaks his vengeance. As one who experienced to some extent in Germany the bombing by the British, and later in England the bombing by the Germans—it was minor, compared to what we have done in Indochina—I rejoiced that Americans had been spared that ordeal.

But no longer. It now occurs to me that, until we go through it ourselves, until our people cower in the shelters of New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles and elsewhere while the buildings collapse overhead and burst into flames, and dead bodies hurtle about and, when it is over for the day or the night, emerge in the rubble to find some of their dear ones mangled, their homes gone, their hospitals, churches, schools demolished—only after that gruesome experience will we realize what we are inflicting on the people of Indochina and especially what we did over Christmas week to the common people of Hanoi.

Does one American in 1,000, or in 100,000, realize that, whereas the Germans dropped 80,000 tons of bombs on Britain in more than five years of war (and we thought it was barbaric), we dropped 100,000 tons on Indochina in the single month of last November, when Nixon restricted the bombing because of the Paris "peace" talks; and that under Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon we have dropped a total of 7 million tons of bombs on Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos—vastly more than we and the British let loose on Germany and Japan together in World War II? It was done in the name of "a just peace," of course. Has not Nixon said it dozens of times, his face on the TV screen frozen in unctuousness, as he sent his troops to invade a new country—Cambodia, Laos—or as he ordered his bombers to resume unloading tens of thousands of tons of more lethal bombs on a country which had no Air Force with which to defend itself?

Hitler, a bully also, mouthed the same hypocrisy. As Francois-Poncet, the French ambassador in Berlin, remarked after the Fuehrer sent his warriors out on the first of his conquests at the very moment when he was showering Europe with a new offer of peace: "Hitler struck his adversary in the face, and then declared: 'I bring your proposals for peace!'"

Is that not what Nixon has done in Vietnam? Where else, since Hitler, has the head of government of a supposedly civilized people declared through a spokesman to his own people (on the eve of an election, to be sure) that "peace is at hand," that 99 per cent of the issues have been negotiated and that only three or four more days of talks are needed to tidy up the agreement, and then (after he is elected) struck the people he has been negotiating with "in good faith" with the most savage bombing in history—and put the blame on them?

I said that after experiencing at first hand the Nazi terror toward others, it never occurred to me that it could happen at home. Has it? To a certain extent? Just a beginning, perhaps? Has Nixon shown that you don't need a totalitarian dictatorship like Hitler's to get by with murder, that you can do it in a democracy as long as the Congress and the people Congress is supposed to represent don't give a damn?

It can be extremely misleading to compare the Nazi regime in Germany with our own situation today. We are not a totalitarian dictatorship. The press, despite the Administration's assaults upon it, is still relatively free. Dissent, despite all the attempts of Nixon and his aides to silence it, is still heard. This article could never have been published under the Fuehrer. Nixon is no Hitler, though with his Christmas bombing he acted like one. The Americans could have thrown him out of office in November. The Germans, after the death of President Hindenburg in 1934, were stuck with Hitler. They had had a parliament, the Reichstag, which, if its members had showed any guts or wisdom, might have restrained him or even overthrown him in his first months of power in 1933, before he tricked it into committing suicide. We have an elected Congress, which had the constitutional power to prevent our Presidents from taking the nation into war in Vietnam and the power to take it out quickly. It abdicated that power. Like the Reichstag, its members were partly tricked (by such things as the Tonkin Gulf frame-up and other Presidential deceptions) and like the German parliament its members have thus far lacked the guts or the wisdom to exercise the power the Constitution gave them.

Here begin the similarities. Are there others? One, I think, is in the attitude of Nixon toward the people. "The average American," he told a Washington Star reporter on the eve of his re-election, "is just like the child in the family." The implication was that the average citizen could easily be manipulated by Papa. It is, of course, a form of contempt for the common people. Disraeli, to whom Nixon compared himself in the same interview, had it, but surely the great Presidents—Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, even Eisenhower—did not. Hitler, for all his professed love of the German people and his attempt to make them the Master Race, had a profound contempt for them. He thought they were simpletons, at least politically—you could do anything with them. He called them, as Trevor-Roper has pointed out, Dickschadel, Querschadel, Dummkoepe—blockheads and ninnyes without political sense. But he would add: "Even stupid races can accomplish something, given good leadership." Once at a Nuremberg party rally, when asked to explain why the German masses became so delirious at these pageants, especially when he spoke, Hitler told a group of American correspondents—off the record—in words almost identical to Nixon's, that it was because they were children at heart. "What luck for rulers," he exclaimed on another occasion, "that men do not think."

And in these days I cannot help recalling an opinion vouching by one of Hitler's woman secretaries after his death. "Though Hitler," she recalled, "ranged over almost every field of thought, I nevertheless felt that something was missing. . . . It seems to me that his spate of words lacked the human note, the spiritual quality of a cultivated man. In his library he had no classic work, no single book on which the human spirit had left its trace."

There were other things in Nazi Germany which recent happenings in this country have forced me, at least, to recall:

(1) Justice and the courts. One day in 1936 Hans Frank, the Nazi Minister of Justice (who was later sentenced to death at Nuremberg and hanged), called in the members of the bench and gave them a little advice: "Say to yourself at every decision that you make: 'How would the Fuehrer decide in my place?'" One wonders sometimes—I mean no disrespect to our judges—if some of the eminent jurists appointed by the President, especially those on the Supreme Court, do not at the moment of decision say to themselves: "How would President Nixon decide in my place?" Nixon's

Front Four on the High Court, Burger, Blackmun, Rehnquist and Powell—joined often by "Whizzer" White, Kennedy's only contribution to that bench—have shown a teamwork that must be the envy of Coach Allen's fearsome Front Four, and they have used it increasingly to limit freedoms supposedly guaranteed by the First Amendment, to take but one example. In doing so they cannot have failed to please Nixon. Did he not boast that he appointed only those who shared his philosophy? Most other Presidents have been proud of trying to keep a balance on the Court.

(2) Assaults on the freedom of the press, First Amendment guarantees, dissent. Obviously we have not fallen as far as Nazi Germany, but are we not on our way? Have not Nixon and his minions carried on for four years an assault on our press freedoms and on the right to dissent—and not without success? They have intimidated the networks, threatened TV station owners with loss of their licenses if they do not, in effect, censor network news critical of the Administration, and successfully gone to court to induce the Supreme Court to rule by 5 to 4 that the First Amendment does not give reporters the right to protect their confidential sources—a telling blow to our press freedoms. On the other hand, the Administration, by propaganda, deceit, evasion, playing favorites, and by expert use of the power of the White House to make news and control it, has done very well in putting its own story over in the press. But this has not satisfied Nixon.

I sometimes wonder if he, and Klein, would envy the way the press was handled in Berlin in the days when I was working there. Every morning the editors of the capital's newspapers and the correspondents of out-of-town German journals were made to assemble at the Propaganda Ministry and told by Goebbels or one of his aides what news to print and what to suppress, how to write the news and headline it, and what editorials were to be written that day. To avoid any misunderstanding, a daily written Directive was furnished at the end of the oral instructions. For smaller provincial papers and periodicals without representatives in Berlin, Directives were sent by wire or mail. Radio (there was no TV then) was handled separately but similarly. Every editor, reporter, newscaster and commentator knew each day exactly what to write or say, and did it. Very simple and effective. Nixon's task obviously is more difficult, but he keeps plugging. As one of our great historians, Henry Steele Commager, wrote recently: "Never before in our history . . . has government so audaciously violated the spirit of the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press."

(3) Terror bombing, "targeting military objectives only," and the lies about them. Here we come closer to the Nazi example. Hitler invented terror bombing (unless you count Mussolini's puny effort in Ethiopia), starting with Guernica in Spain and going on to Warsaw, Rotterdam and Coventry. Nixon has been an apt pupil, increasing the terror by more and bigger bombs, but sticking to the same lies about "targeting military objectives" and the same denials of damage to nonmilitary objectives. Nixon's aides, Ronald Ziegler at the White House and Jerry Friedheim at the Pentagon, seem more adept at this business than even Joseph Goebbels. More adept and just as arrogant.

Ziegler, speaking for Nixon, offered two justifications for the Christmas resumption of the bombing—both offensive to the truth and to an American's intelligence. First, he linked the bombing to the threat of another Communist offensive: "We are not going to allow the peace talks to be used as a cover for another offensive." But he offered no evidence of an offensive, and the American Command in Saigon admitted it knew of none pending, nor did anyone in Washington.

Next, Ziegler, speaking for his silent boss, declared that Nixon was "determined" to continue his bombing until Hanoi decided to resume negotiations "in a spirit of good will and in a constructive attitude." In the Hitler-Nixon double-talk that meant, "until Hanoi agrees to accept a peace that we dictate."

Jerry Friedheim at the Pentagon was worse—he was pure Goebbels. Twice, on December 27 and 29, he denied that we had damaged Hanoi's Bach Mai Hospital and attributed the reports to "enemy propaganda." The effrontery of this staggered a man who had listened to Goebbels' lies time after time. That was because, two days before the first denial, Telford Taylor, a distinguished lawyer, a retired brigadier general and our chief prosecutor at Nuremberg, had cabled *The New York Times* from Hanoi an eyewitness description of the bombed-out hospital. Moreover, millions of Americans had seen on TV Japanese and Swedish films of the hospital's devastation. Even when Friedheim finally admitted, on January 2, that "some limited accidental damage" had been done to the hospital, he suggested that it might have been caused by "North Vietnamese ordnance or aircraft."

I say Friedheim was pure Goebbels (and like him probably lying at the master's orders) because, after a German submarine had torpedoed the British line *Athenia* on the first day of War World II, I heard Goebbels, first at a press conference and then over the air deny categorically that the Germans had sunk the boat and then accuse the British of having done it. I will pass over Friedheim's bland assertion that if an American POW camp had been hit, as reported, Hanoi would be held responsible—"under the Geneva Convention." But it did remind me of Hitler's declaration on the mornings he attacked Norway, and later Holland and Belgium, that if they resisted they would be held responsible for the bloodshed. After Friedheim's performance, according to the *New York Times* of January 5, he was awarded the Defense Department Medal for Distinguished Public Service, with the citation: "He has provided with faultless professionalism clear, concise, accurate and timely information concerning the worldwide activities of the Department of Defense."

Did the President become enraged when Henry Kissinger returned from Paris without the agreement he had demanded and in his fury (You can't do that to Richard Nixon!) order the resumption of the murderous bombing—Christmas or no? We do not know for sure, and probably never will, though Washington seethed with rumors unconfirmed, that such was the case. Perhaps "high-ranking U.S. officials in Saigon," as an A.P. dispatch called them, were, for once, telling the truth when they said, according to the news agency, that "the ultimate purpose of the bombing was to punish Hanoi," and that "President Thieu had been told, that President Nixon's strategy is to devastate North Vietnam."

It recalled a scene, which was confirmed, on the night of March 26, 1941, when news reached Hitler that the pro-Nazi government of Yugoslavia had been toppled and replaced by one that might not do the Fuehrer's bidding. The news, according to some of those present in the chancellery, threw Hitler into one of the wildest rages of his life. He took it, they said, as a personal affront—you couldn't do that to Hitler. He called in his generals and ordered them "to destroy Yugoslavia militarily and as a nation"—a stenographer noted down his words. "Yugoslavia," he added, "would be crushed with unmerciful harshness." He ordered Goering to "destroy Belgrade in attacks by waves" of bombers. That was done; the town was razed. Like large parts of Hanoi these past days.

It could have been, of course, that Nixon

made his Yuletide decision to devastate Hanoi in a completely different mood—in a moment of icy calculation. Hitler was in that kind of mood on September 29, 1941 as his armies neared Moscow and Leningrad. His Directive to his army commanders that day began: "The Fuehrer has decided to have Leningrad wiped off the face of the earth. The intention is to raze it to the ground by artillery and continuous air attack. The problem of survival of the population (3 million) is one which cannot and should not be solved by us." He issued a second Directive to the same effect for Moscow. Is it possible that Nixon issued a similar Directive for Hanoi in the same cold-blooded mood? The A.P. report from Saigon indicates the possibility.

(4) Hitler got by with murder because there was no restraining hand upon him—from any source. Did any hand in Washington try to restrain Nixon when he ordered the invasion of Cambodia and Laos, and especially when he ordered the devastating Christmas bombing of Hanoi? We do not know. But we know he did not consult the Congress. He did not confide in it or in the people.

Perhaps we are experiencing here what the Greeks called hubris, the sin of overweening pride. It has brought the downfall of so many conquerors—of the Greeks themselves, the Romans, the French under Napoleon, the Germans under Wilhelm II and then Hitler. And we are seeing in Washington what I saw in Berlin in the Nazi time—how power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

PEOPLES GAS LINKS APOLLO TO FUEL TEST

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Chicago Tribune discusses the down-to-earth application of fuel cells whose technology was developed as part of the Apollo program. This pilot program using fuel cells to produce electricity from natural gas with high efficiency is another example of the application of space technology to the betterment of our daily living. I commend this article to my colleagues as an example of the importance of space technology to our everyday life:

PEOPLES GAS LINKS APOLLO TO FUEL TEST

Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. has just completed an experiment using the kinship between two unlikely relatives—the Apollo moon exploration program and the apartment building at 8164 Forest Preserve Dr., Chicago.

The experiment links an exotic aspect of the space program with the practical earth application—using natural gas-fueled power cells to generate electricity. The fuel cells use the same technology as the space program, although the Apollo cells start with hydrogen.

Peoples Gas is one of 32 gas and gas-electric companies conducting power cell experiments under a \$50 million program called TARGET [Team to Advance Research for Gas Energy Transformation]. Prime contractor for the program is the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., which supplied fuel cells for the Apollo program.

SHOWED PROMISE

Although the group isn't releasing results of the fuel cell test in Chicago, the assump-

tion is that it has shown good promise for commercial application in the not-too-distant future.

The apartment building in Chicago was the first residential test in the city for fuel cells, whose advantage lies in the capability to produce electricity efficiently, cleanly, and quietly at the point of use.

The first test in Chicago was with one fuel cell at a Midas Muffler Shop at 6200 W. Belmont Ave., and the apartment test involved three units.

EXPECTED RESULTS

"In a general way, I might observe that results were about what we expected for this stage in our research," said George M. Morrow, Peoples Gas president. "Admittedly, we experienced some downtime which was anticipated with the prototype equipment being used."

"In our test at the apartment building, we were able to exceed the 2,000 operating hours which was our goal for the three-month test."

Morrow said that in comparison with the use of gas in conventional generation, a natural gas fuel cell uses about 25 percent less fuel to deliver the same amount of electricity, and it emits only about 1/100th of the pollutants produced by coal or oil fired stations.

"As an illustration of potential benefits, in the 12 months through June of 1972, we sold Commonwealth Edison 41.1 billion cubic feet of natural gas for use in making electricity in Chicago."

"If 25 percent of this gas were conserved, or put to residential use, it would be equivalent to the annual amount of gas used to heat 76,000 single-family homes."

In contrast to a steam turbine system which burns fuel in a boiler to produce steam to drive turbine rotors to drive a generator, a fuel cell takes natural gas and air and combines them electrochemically to produce electricity.

The Target program began in 1967, and field tests are now underway in the second part of the program. By the end of 1972, about 60 fuel cell power plants will have been tested by various companies throughout the U.S. and Canada.

The unit used in the test has a capacity to generate 12½ kilowatts of power. For larger needs a series of the cells were installed.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, 1973 marks the 100th anniversary of the occupancy of the Washington County Courthouse. This notable structure on West Washington Street has served the county and the citizens of Washington County, Md., well.

The cornerstone of the red brick structure was laid on October 9, 1872, but the courthouse was not occupied until late in 1873. The county commissioners held their first meeting in the new building in January 1874. Plans for the anniversary celebration have not been completed; however, the courthouse is now being sandblasted to return it to its original red brick. In this anniversary year, the Washington County Courthouse will take on its original appearance, and an artist's rendition of the building will grace the official county stationery.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today legislation to provide for a national health insurance program.

Together with a number of other cosponsors, I am pleased to submit this proposal for a national health insurance plan that, in my opinion, will provide high quality medical care for all Americans and at a cost this Nation can afford. While this legislative proposal contains a number of new features offering broader coverage, it is basically the same medicredit bill that I and other cosponsors introduced into the 92d Congress. You will recall that in the last Congress this medicredit bill had 174 sponsors, far more than any other national health insurance proposal.

My colleague from Tennessee, Mr. FULTON, has earlier described many of the details of medicredit and how it will provide high quality health care to all Americans, each American contributing to the proposal's overall cost on the basis of what he can afford to pay.

I would like to emphasize a few of the more important provisions in this bill, both from the standpoint of its beneficiaries—the American people—and from the standpoint of the fiscal and administrative integrity of the Federal Government.

From the standpoint of the public, medicredit will go a long way toward solving the more immediate and pressing problems of our health care system.

Medicredit will remove the financial barriers that have blocked many poor Americans in the past from the opportunity to receive high quality health and medical care.

Medicredit will assure every American that he no longer need fear the crippling financial consequences of a catastrophic illness or injury.

Medicredit stresses preventive health care to help keep people well. Its comprehensive provisions include coverage for annual checkups, in and out of hospital X-ray and laboratory tests, dental care for children, home health services, immunization, and psychiatric care and counseling.

Medicredit protects the right of the American people to choose the health care setting which they believe best for themselves and their families—the private physician in solo practice, or the physician who chooses to practice in a group, or a prepaid plan, including HMO's, or a clinic.

Medicredit, with its insistence that qualified health insurance plans must meet high standards with respect to comprehensive coverage and minimum benefits, will do much to bring equitable uniformity to health insurance plans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out another and most important aspect

of the medicredit proposal: The way it will be financed.

It has been estimated that medicredit will cost in the vicinity of \$12.1 billion in new money. That is an enormous amount of money. But let us look at the costs of a counter proposal for national health insurance, the one sponsored by Senator Kennedy and Congresswoman Griffiths.

According to a report prepared for the House Ways and Means Committee during the last session, the Kennedy-Griffiths proposal would have cost the taxpayers a staggering \$91 billion a year. This would have meant that health alone took up more than one-third of the entire Federal budget. The average family's Federal tax bill for health would have gone from \$457 a year to \$1,305 a year, nearly triple.

Under this counter proposal everyone in the United States, rich or poor, would have Uncle Sam pay all or most of his health care bill each year. In addition, the administration of such a proposal would require the establishment of a great and unwieldy Federal health bureaucracy that, judging from past experience, would be almost completely unresponsive to the individualistic nature of the American people.

The medicredit proposal, on the other hand, is designed to spread the cost of medical and health care fairly and equitably over the population on the basis of each American's ability to pay. The poor would pay nothing. But as income tax liability went up, the extent of the Government's assistance would go down. However, to encourage all Americans to buy high quality, comprehensive health insurance, some Government assistance would be given to every taxpayer.

And most importantly, medicredit builds upon our present system, takes advantage of the good parts, corrects the bad parts.

For example, medicredit will bring for the first time Federal standards and supervision to the private health insurance industry.

On the other hand, the opposition proposal would completely dismantle the present system, including our private insurance system with all of its expertise, and attempt to establish a new and untried system.

Implicit in the medicredit proposal is that the ultimate solution to all the complex problems of our health care delivery system will be found in a variety of approaches—governmental and nongovernmental, legislative and nonlegislative—utilizing, not abandoning, the present pluralistic strengths of the system.

A single and sweeping piece of legislation cannot put to right every single one of our health care problems. For we have many problems. Financing is only one of them and it is of financing that medicredit primarily addresses itself.

Medicredit is a program for now, a foundation upon which many additional programs may be soundly built in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I commend your attention to the medicredit proposal. I believe this bill can provide high quality care to all Americans, and at a price the Nation can afford.

A summary of the medicredit plan follows:

MEDICREDIT IN SUMMARY

Medicredit is a three-pronged approach to providing health insurance protection. The proposal would:

- (1) Pay the full cost of health insurance for those too poor to buy their own;
- (2) Help those who can afford to pay a part of their health insurance cost. The less they can afford to pay, the more the Government would pay;
- (3) See to it that no American would have to bankrupt himself because of a catastrophic illness.

The Government would pay all of the premium for low-income people—an individual and his dependents with no income tax liability. For others, the Government would pay between 10 percent and 99 percent, based on the family or individual income. It would pay everyone's premium for catastrophic expense coverage.

Coverage under this program would be provided through private health insurance. Enrollment in prepaid groups would be included.

A qualified policy would offer comprehensive insurance against the ordinary and catastrophic expenses of illness. Preventive care would be stressed, including physical exams, well-baby care, inoculations, and X-ray and laboratory work in or out of the hospital. Basic benefits in a 12-month period would include 60 days of hospital care or 120 days in an extended care facility. Other basic benefits would provide emergency and out-patient services and all medical services provided by physicians or osteopaths. Added to this year's bill as basic benefits are coverage of home health services, dental care for children, and emergency dental services for all. The catastrophic expense protection would pay expenses in excess of the basic coverage, including hospital, extended care facility, in-patient drugs, blood, prosthetic appliances, and other specified services, including physicians.

Psychiatric care would be covered without limit.

There would be a deductible of \$50 per hospital stay, and 20 percent coinsurance (maximum \$100 per family per year) on medical expenses, emergency or out-patient expenses, and dental services. Under the catastrophic illness provisions, the amount of the "financial corridor" would be 10 percent of the previous year's taxable income reduced by the total deductibles and coinsurance incurred under the basic coverage.

A beneficiary eligible for full payment of premium by the federal government would be entitled to a certificate acceptable by carriers for health care insurance for himself and his dependents. Eligible beneficiaries with whom the government would be sharing the cost of premium could elect between a credit against income tax or a certificate.

To participate in the Medicredit program, a carrier would have to qualify under state law, provide certain basic coverage, make coverage available without regard to pre-existing health conditions and guarantee annual renewal. Enrollment in the program would be open to individuals during May and November of each year.

HAILS MRS. LILLIAN ALLAN

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, for many years Mrs. Lillian Allan has been one of my key advisers

in matters dealing with the problems of older Americans. I have come to lean on her for advice and counsel and her advice has been uniformly good.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out to Members of this House that I have been able to incorporate several of her good ideas into legislation on several occasions. Thus, she is one of the unsung heroines of the legislative arena.

Recently, Mrs. Allan was elected president of the Hudson County, N.J., Council of Senior Citizens. On this occasion I would like to publicly hail Mrs. Allan for untiring efforts through the years and wish her many years of good health and happiness.

PRIVILEGES OF RANK IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, 1972, an article by Jack Anderson on privileges of rank in the Pentagon appeared in Parade magazine.

That article prompted correspondence between myself and the Defense Department which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

The article and correspondence follow:

THE PRIVILEGES OF RANK IN THE PENTAGON (By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Each weekday morning on the shores of the Potomac, a curious event takes place. A dozen uniformed Air Force generals line up single file on a dock at Bolling Air Force Base—just four miles downstream from the Pentagon. Clutching briefcases, the generals step gingerly over a wooden plank into a plush, 48-foot motor launch. Each general sits in his own comfortable lawn chair. His feet rest on an expensive red carpet which is vacuumed daily. As the powerful launch pushes off, coffee is served.

What's happening here? The men who run the Pentagon are going to work. All over town, in fact, brass hats and bigwigs enjoy a leisurely ride to the office. The privileges of rank are apparent everywhere.

On the ground, scores of limousines equipped with telephones and reading lamps, arrive at the Pentagon's main entrance.

In the air, helicopters begin ferrying the big brass who prefer to keep above the traffic tangles. Enough whirlybirds have been spared from the Vietnam war to provide air taxi service for as many as 125 Pentagon big shots each day. The unwritten Pentagon policy: Three stars are required for a chopper to Andrews Air Force Base; four stars are necessary for the Pentagon's shortest junket to the Army-Navy Country Club across the turnpike.

Aside from the privileged few, most of the Pentagon's employees have to make it to work on their own. Some 10,000 drive cars, thousands more take the bus; about 100 ride bicycles.

Back on the dock at Bolling, as the generals speed off in their staff boat, 40 airmen crowd into a smaller craft that looks like a floating bus. The airmen's schooner, which chugs along at half the speed of the general's boat, is always crowded. "We try to squeeze in," explained an Air Force major.

STATUS SYMBOLS

The point made in the early morning is repeated throughout the day: the top brass travel first class. Everyone else goes steerage.

An enclosed city of concrete rings and corridors, the Pentagon is ruled by an almost impenetrable bureaucracy. The place is so top-heavy with officers that one-star generals are treated like captains and captains are treated like lieutenants. An exaggeration? Early this year the Pentagon's top brass trooped up to Capitol Hill to explain why they wanted billions more next year for defense. As senators and generals argued, a young captain in the rear of the conference room caught our eye. He was leaning against the wall, staring at the floor, earning his day's salary, holding two armfuls of brass hats.

With so many chiefs, the struggle for status in the Pentagon is fierce. Little things begin to count: a huge desk, a private bathroom, a spy-proof conference room. Sometimes status is measured by the number of buttons on a telephone. Adm. Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, has a phone with 64. The button that glows with a red halo is for the President.

DINING IN STYLE

We have investigated the special privileges enjoyed by the military elite. When it comes to supplying themselves with the basic necessities of life, the Pentagon potentates spare no expense. Here is a report:

Food: In the Pentagon's private dining room, Army generals dine royally in leather-cushioned chairs. The day we visited, their menu included salmon croquettes and bearnaise sauce, braised lean ribs of beef, Portuguese skinless and boneless sardines, chilled clams, Mexican omelettes, asparagus spears, sherry and chocolate snowballs. The portions were generous. The price per meal: \$1. (Nearby, on the same floor, in the public dining room, G.I.'s pay \$1.20 for a hot pasty sandwich served with cole slaw, potato chips and a pickle slice.)

HEARTY APPETITE

The top civilians, not to be outdone, also dine well on subsidized delicacies. The secretaries of the armed services wage a daily war with their waistlines. Consider Secretary of the Navy John Warner, for instance. His mess chief, Melvin Williams, told us with considerable pride: "I've seen Mr. Warner eat a serving of lamb chops, liver, fish, poached eggs and bacon for breakfast—all at one sitting."

Transportation: A pampered general never walks when he can ride, never rides when he can fly. Status again is at stake. In the name of "official business," practically any form of transportation is available 24 hours a day. A ranking general can take a limousine to the Pentagon where he can catch a helicopter to Andrews Air Force Base where he can fly in a VIP plane anywhere in the world.

Such service can lead to abuse. The Pentagon's auto fleet, for example, has become a luxury limousine service for military potentates and their Congressional friends. They are frequently chauffeured about Washington in military cars. In fact, the Defense Department maintains special rented limousines for Congressional chairmen who need to be buttered up.

AN EXTRA CADILLAC

In the Pentagon, probably the most chauffeured man is its leader, Secretary Melvin Laird, who has a back-up Cadillac just in case something might go wrong with his regular Cadillac.

Laird's special assistant, Carl Wallace, is also picked up each morning and delivered home each evening by military chauffeur. The Pentagon had to skirt regulations to provide Wallace with such treatment.

For special occasions, the limousine logs-

tics are enough to take your breath away. Motor pool regulars tell us that for the last Army-Navy game dozens of rented limousines hauled the brass hats to Philadelphia in style. And during the Nixon Inaugural as many as 400 Pentagon cars were rented to whisk generals and admirals to various Republican victory parties.

Shelter: Generals and admirals dwell in lavish quarters on command posts throughout the world. But no row of military homes is more impressive than the generals' compound at Fort Myer, within easy helicopter distance of the Pentagon.

ELEGANT MANSIONS

The homes are elegant red brick mansions—if cavernous—and built to last. The most magnificent have huge bay windows that look out onto spacious yards lined with large shade trees.

In one general's basement, we found all the trappings that go with rank. Along one wall were hung white mess jackets, formal butler jackets and black chauffeur uniforms for the enlisted aides. In another home, we had a chance to inspect a general's kitchen, which had two of everything—two ranges, two ovens, two refrigerators. We were puzzled by the duplication. "When you're broiling a dozen steaks, one stove just isn't enough," we were told.

Inside all these homes, GI servants scurry about cooking meals, washing windows, arranging flowers. These enlisted aides, as they are delicately called, are trained to pamper the military elite. Many find the job develops talents unheard of elsewhere in the military. One servant, for example, became skilled at ice sculpturing for dinner parties. The wife of the admiral he served so appreciated his art that she purchased a huge deep freeze at public expense so his sculptures would not melt prematurely.

What's daily life like inside the homes? "My job is like being a count," said William "Smiley" Stewart, a seasoned enlisted Army aide at Fort Myer.

Smiley, an articulate GI who has won praise from the Joint Chiefs for his cooking, says he enjoys his job, but admits he has certain apprehensions. "I am continually haunted by the thought that I will be replaced someday by a TV dinner."

Does he ever find his job demeaning? "No," said Smiley, "but there are certain things I would never do. I would never walk a general's dog or launder his wife's underwear."

IMPRESSIVE WARDROBES

Clothing: Like movie stars, generals and admirals take an inordinate interest in their appearance. Their wardrobes are impressive. For an Army general it includes: fatigues, regular Army greens, tropical wear, dress blues, dress whites, mess blues, mess whites and a civilian tuxedo.

A general who attends several different functions during the day may wear as many as four different uniforms. With 1323 flag-rank officers in the four military services, taxpayers spend a fortune just cleaning the clothes of their generals and admirals.

But Sgt. Stewart thinks the cost is worth it. "Nothing is more important to me than the way my man looks," he said. "He's got to look sharp, feel sharp. Every button must be in place. Every crease in his uniform perfect. His shoes are going to shine, yes, shine."

It is the GI servant, of course, who shines those shoes. And the taxpayers pay for all the spit and polish.

NOVEMBER 15, 1972.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was exceedingly distressed by the contents of Jack Anderson's article "The Privileges of Rank in the Pen-

tagon" that appeared in the November 12, 1972, issue of *Parade*.

Mr. Anderson refers to a number of activities about which I would like precise information:

1. How many officers use the launch from Bolling Air Force Base? Why do they use this form of transportation?

2. How many limousines are used on a daily basis to transport civilian and military employees to and from work?

3. How many helicopters are used as a commuter service to and from work? How many are made available to employees during the day?

4. What is the justification for charging one dollar for a meal in the private dining room, when less substantial meals in the cafeterias cost more?

5. Is there a 24-hour stand-by transportation pool? Of what is it composed?

6. How many limousines are rented for the use of Congressional committee chairmen?

7. How many limousines will be used to transport employees to this year's Army-Navy game? What is the justification for their use?

8. How many enlisted aides are employed in the homes of ranking officers?

9. Is the purchase of home appliances, such as freezers, at public expense permitted? Does this violate any regulations or laws?

10. Does the government subsidize the laundry bills of ranking officers? If so, why?

I would appreciate your response to these questions, as well as your general comments on the Anderson article, at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1972.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Secretary Laird has asked that I respond to your letter requesting information on a recent article concerning the Department of Defense which appeared in *Parade Magazine*.

The following information relates to the numbered paragraphs contained in your letter of November 15.

1. During morning and evening rush hour periods an average of 51 officers and enlisted personnel are transported by motor launch between the Pentagon and Bolling Air Force Base. The boat transportation system between Bolling Air Force Base and the Pentagon is part of the DoD inter-base transportation system, along with buses, which connects military installations in the Washington area. The system functions to produce better work utilization for Department of Defense military and civilian personnel.

2. There are 63 civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense in the Washington, D.C. area who are authorized official transportation to and from work.

3. The Department has a small number of helicopters assigned to the Washington area for the primary mission of evacuating key government civilian and military personnel in event of emergency. To maintain peak readiness for this mission, crews must fly often. There are no regularly scheduled flights. No specific locations are serviced. However, when priority transportation is required for top DoD or other government officials these helicopters are available. This practice enables these officials to devote the time that would be lost in surface transportation to conduct further official business at their office.

4. Private messes in the Pentagon provide a

facility for senior military and civilian officials in which business can be conducted, if necessary, in a secure environment. The facilities are not normally open to the public, since they are very small. These messes, like officer messes at military installations, are non-appropriated fund activities, operated on a non-profit basis. The menus are limited to a few luncheon items, and prices are established, adjusted, and assessed each member on the basis of the food served. The room pictured in the magazine is not a private mess. Newsmen who cover the Pentagon and other members of the public eat there frequently.

5. The Pentagon Motor Pool operates on a 24-hour basis and has sedans available for official transportation on a shift basis as follows:

7:30 AM to 4:00 PM—45 sedans.

4:00 PM to 12 Midnight—22 sedans.

12 Midnight to 7:30 PM—11 sedans.

6. There are no limousines rented for the use of Congressional committee chairmen by the Department of Defense.

7. No limousines will be used to transport employees to the Army-Navy game.

8. In the Washington, D.C. area there are presently 311 enlisted aides assigned to ranking officers.

9. Usual household appliances such as stoves, refrigerators and freezers are provided with Government quarters and are the property of the Government.

10. Ranking officers are responsible for their own laundry bills.

We will be pleased to provide any additional information you may require on this matter.

Sincerely,

D. O. COOKE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DECEMBER 12, 1972.

Mr. D. O. COOKE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Defense Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOKE: Thank you for your letter of December 1 concerning questions raised by Jack Anderson's recent *Parade* article on the Defense Department. I appreciate your supplying the information that you did.

There are a few areas, however, where I would like additional information:

1. Would you please list, by name and title, the 63 department officials who are authorized official transportation to and from work.

2. How many helicopters are available as priority transportation for department officials? You just referred to a "small number."

3. Does the operation of the private Pentagon and officer messes on a non-profit basis permit the \$1 meal charge referred to in the Anderson article?

What exactly does "non-profit" method of operation mean?

Are public and enlisted personnel messes operated on the same non-profit basis? If not, why not?

4. Does the total of enlisted aides (311) include Naval stewards? If not, how many stewards are employed as household aides in the Washington area. On what basis are the aides and stewards assigned? What are their functions? To whom are they assigned?

Thank you for your consideration of this further request.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C. January 10, 1973.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: This is in response to your request of 12 December 1972 for additional information concerning the article in *Parade Magazine*.

The following numbered paragraphs relate to those in your letter.

1. A list of DoD personnel authorized official transportation to and from work is enclosed as Attachment 1.

2. Army maintains 29 and Air Force 13 helicopters which have secondary, as available, missions of providing priority transportation for key Defense officials.

(3) Yes.

(b) "Non-profit" method of operation means that the messes are operated on a break even basis so that no surplus of funds is accumulated.

(c) Public messes (cafeterias and dining rooms) are operated by a commercial firm and permitted to earn a profit. However, this operation lost money from September 1968 to March 1972. Since March 1972 a very modest profit has been realized as a result of a change in management. In these facilities every effort is made to keep prices as low as possible while still providing wholesome, appealing food.

One enlisted mess is operated in the Pentagon for serving the noon meal to motor pool personnel. Price of lunch in the mess halls is \$.70.

4. The total of 311 enlisted aides includes 101 Navy stewards. These stewards are assigned to flag officers occupying public quarters. The use of stewards in quarters is individually authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, acting in accordance with the specific provisions of Federal Statute (10 USC Code 7569). SECNAV Instruction 1306.2A (Attachment 2) sets forth "Guidelines for Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staffs".

I trust you will find this information satisfactory for your use.

Sincerely,

D. O. COOKE,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICIALS IN WASHINGTON AREA AUTHORIZED TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN DOMICILE AND PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

1. The Secretary of Defense—Melvin R. Laird.

2. The Deputy Secretary of Defense—Kenneth Rush.

3. The Secretary of the Army—Robert F. Froehle.

4. The Secretary of the Navy—John W. Warner.

5. The Secretary of the Air Force—Robert C. Seamans, Jr.

6. Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff—Adm. Thomas H. Moorer.

7. Chief of Staff of the Army—Gen. Creighton W. Abrams.

8. Chief of Naval Operations—Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.

9. Chief of Staff of the Air Force—Gen. John D. Ryan.

10. Commandant of the Marine Corps—Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr.

11. Director of Defense Research & Engineering—John S. Foster, Jr.

12. Assistant Secretary of Defense (C)—Robert C. Moot.

13. Assistant Secretary of Defense (H&E)—Richard S. Wilbur.

14. Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L)—Barry J. Shillito.

15. Assistant Secretary of Defense (I)—Albert C. Hall.

16. Assistant Secretary of Defense (ISA)—G. Warren Nutter.

17. Assistant Secretary of Defense (M&RA) Roger T. Kelley.

18. Assistant Secretary of Defense (PA)—Daniel Z. Henkin.

19. Assistant Secretary of Defense (SA)—Gardiner L. Tucker.

20. Assistant Secretary of Defense (T)—Eberhardt Reichtin.

21. General Counsel of the Department of Defense—J. Fred Buzhardt.

CXIX—107—Part 2

22. Under Secretary of the Army—Kenneth E. BeLieu.

23. Under Secretary of the Navy—Frank Sanders.

24. Under Secretary of the Air Force—John L. McLucas.

25. Vice Chief of Staff of the Army—Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr.

26. Vice Chief of Naval Operations—Adm. M. F. Weisner.

27. Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force—Gen. Horace M. Wade.

28. Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps—Gen. Earl E. Anderson.

29. Assistant Secretary of the Army (FM)—R. L. Saintsing (Acting).

30. Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&L)—Dudley C. Mecum.

31. Assistant Secretary of the Army (M&RA)—Hadlial A. Hull.

32. Assistant Secretary of the Army (R&D)—Robert L. Johnson.

33. Assistant Secretary of the Navy (M&RA)—James E. Johnson.

34. Assistant Secretary of the Navy (I&L)—Charles L. Ill.

35. Assistant Secretary of the Navy (FM)—Robert D. Nesen.

36. Assistant Secretary of the Navy (R&D)—Robert A. Frosch.

37. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (I&L)—Lewis E. Turner (Acting).

38. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (R&D)—Grant L. Hansen.

39. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (M&RA)—Richard J. Borda.

40. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (FM)—Spencer J. Schedler.

41. Commanding General, Army Materiel Command—Gen. Henry A. Miley.

42. Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency—John E. Davis.

43. Military Assistant to Dr. Kissinger—Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr. (Moved to Vice Chief of Staff of the Army on 4 January 1973).

44. Special Assistant to the President for Manpower and Mobilization—Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

45. Chief, Naval Material—Adm. Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.

46. Commander Air Force Systems Command—Gen. George S. Brown.

47. Chairman, Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission—Carl Walske.

48. Director, Joint Staff—Lt. Gen. George M. Seignious II.

49. Director, National Security Agency—Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips.

50. The Special Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense—Carl S. Wallace.

51. Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense—William J. Baroody, Jr.

52. General Counsel, Department of Army—Robert W. Berry.

Total reduced from 63 due to duplicate reporting of 11 positions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., April 3, 1972.

SECNAV Instruction 1306.2A.

From: Secretary of the Navy.

To: All Ships and Stations.

Subject: Guidelines for Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staffs.

Reference: (a) DOD Directive 13.15.9 of 2 February 1960 (NOTAL).

1. Purpose. To prescribe the policies governing the use of enlisted personnel on the personal staff of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, in order to:

a. Provide general guidance for the efficient utilization of enlisted personnel on personal staffs.

b. Preclude improper utilization of enlisted personnel by assignment to duties which:

(1) Have no reasonable connection with the efficient employment of the Navy and Marine Corps as fighting forces.

(2) Contribute only to the personal benefit of individual officers or their families.

2. Cancellation. SECNAV Instruction 1306.2 is canceled and superseded.

3. Applicability. This directive is applicable to the Department of the Navy on a continuing basis, and to the Coast Guard when operating as a service in the Department of the Navy.

4. Background. Reference (a) cites pertinent legal references and delineates the Secretary of Defense's policy in the premises, to the effect that:

a. Enlisted personnel on the personal staff of an officer are authorized for the purpose of relieving the officer of those minor tasks and details which, if performed by the officer himself, would be at the expense of his primary and official duties.

b. The duties of these enlisted personnel shall be concerned with tasks relating to the military and official responsibility of the officer, to further the accomplishment of a necessary military purpose.

c. The propriety of such duties is governed by the purpose which they serve rather than the nature of the duties.

5. Definitions:

a. "Efficient utilization" is defined as proper, appropriate, and gainful employment or use of men, money or facilities. For purposes of this instruction it encompasses the use of personnel for any type of duty that can be construed as personal in nature, regardless of occupational specialty, billet title, or organizational location of the individual performing that duty.

b. "Personal staff" is defined as those personnel who are authorized to the person of an officer by the Chief of Naval Personnel or the Commandant of the Marine Corps for other than command duties and who report directly to the officer concerned. For purposes of this instruction and in addition to its specific meaning, the term will further include any personnel who might be construed by the Service or the public as members of a personal staff because of the duties assigned. This specifically includes personnel assigned to duty in the public quarters of an officer.

c. "Official duty" is defined as those actions and activities which are required by the officer's billet, position, office, or rank. It includes functions of military and military-civilian activities, both temporary and continuing. It encompasses actions initiated by and accomplished through either oral or written media, whether during or after normal working hours.

6. Guidelines for Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staff:

a. Enlisted personnel on the personal staffs of general and flag officers, and certain other senior officers who are in command positions, may be utilized for:

(1) Providing essential services to such officers in the field and aboard ship. The purpose of such services is to assist the senior officer by relieving him of a multitude of details of an administrative and personal nature associated with his position or office in order that he may devote the maximum of time and effort to more important matters relating to military planning, policy, operations, training, exercises or maneuvers.

(2) Duty in their quarters to assist these officers in the discharge of their official responsibilities, to include assistance in the care of the quarters. The purpose of these services is to assist the senior officer in public quarters by relieving him of a multitude of administrative and personal details directly related to his official duties, to assist in the security, upkeep, and police of the public quarters assigned him, and to assist in official military and military-civilian functions therein.

b. The assignment of enlisted personnel to duties contributing solely to the personnel benefit of officers and which have no reasonable connection with the officer's official responsibilities is prohibited. The purpose served, not the nature of such duties, determines the propriety. An exhaustive listing of specific duties authorized or prohibited is therefore infeasible; however, the following are clear-cut examples:

(7) Acceptable utilization:

(a) Enlisted men driving the official vehicle of senior officers who are engaged in military functions.

(b) Utilization of stewards for the following duties is consistent with the policies of the Secretary of Defense and this instruction:

1. Preparation and serving of food and beverages, including cooking, baking, meat cutting, and scullery duties.

2. Care for the cleanliness, order, and protective maintenance of the officer's quarters and the furniture, fixtures, and appliances therein.

3. Preparation for and duties during official entertaining in the officer's quarters, including receiving guests, checking articles of outer clothing, and serving food and beverages.

4. Services of stewards other than those outlined in (1) through (3) above may be consistent with the Secretary of Defense's policies and this instruction when viewed from the standpoint of the purpose served; however, the official concerned must make a determination in each instance.

(2) Unacceptable utilization.

(a) Care and exercising of pets.

(b) Caring for infants or children.

(c) Personal services for dependents which do not fall within the intent of subparagraph 5a above.

c. This instruction does not preclude officers from the employment of enlisted personnel on a voluntary, paid outside-working hours basis. Inasmuch as personnel on active duty are in a 24-hour daily duty status, voluntary employment by officers shall be exercised with care to insure that the time, talents, and attention of enlisted personnel in the performance of their regular duties continue to receive precedence during that entire period.

d. Responsibility for the supervision, direction, and performance of duty of enlisted personnel assigned to duty on the personal staff or in the public quarters of an officer lies solely with this officer.

e. Specific duties of members of a personal staff, and of any enlisted personnel assigned to perform duties which may be construed as being of a personal nature, while generally following the customs of the Services, should be specifically prescribed by the senior officer concerned in each case.

f. Since enlisted personnel assigned to personal staffs may be required to assist the senior officer during normal off-duty hours, compensatory time off should be provided.

7. Action. Implementation of the requirements of this instruction demands discriminating judgment upon the part of all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps. Addressees will insure full compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the guidelines delineated herein.

JOHN W. WARNER,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

GREY MASON

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the north shore of Long Island lost a valued resident and I am personally

saddened by the loss of a close friend. Grey Mason, who for more than 30 years covered Long Island as a journalist, had for the past 10 years, been editor and president of the excellent Community Newspapers weekly chain on Long Island.

Mr. Mason not only observed and wrote about community affairs, but was an active participant in many worthwhile local projects. His deep sensitivity and commitment will be greatly missed.

At this point in the Record, I should like to include the text of an obituary which appeared in Newsday:

GREY MASON

GLEN HEAD.—Grey Mason, 61, an editor of weekly newspapers on the North Shore for more than 30 years, died yesterday of a heart ailment in Community Hospital, Glen Cove.

Mason, who lived here at Pound Hollow Road, has been editor and president of Community Newspapers, Inc., for 10 years until he and a business partner sold the chain in August. Mason remained a director of the firm until his death. The chain consisted of weeklies in Glen Cove, Roslyn, Port Washington, Manhasset and Great Neck. Mason began doing newspaper work on Long Island in the 1930s and edited several North Shore weeklies, including the Roslyn News and the Oyster Bay Pilot, before purchasing Community Newspapers with Peter Benziger of Locust Valley.

Benziger described Mason yesterday as a "tremendously sensitive," gifted newsman who was deeply involved in community affairs. In addition to his work, which included writing columns and editorials, Mason served for many years as an elected trustee of the Jones Fund, which administers the Jones Institute for Nassau County's poor. He was also a director of Community Hospital at Glen Cove, a director of Nassau County Children's Shelter and a trustee of C. W. Post College.

Born in Chicago, Mason's grandfather was the city's mayor during the Chicago fire of 1871. Mason's father Julian, had been editor of daily newspapers in Chicago and New York. Freelance writer Douglas Evans of Glen Cove, a long-time associate of Mason's, recalled that Mason's journalism was considerably more liberal than his father's, but that his liberalism was not extreme. "I wrote a column for him once that got him a little upset, so he decided to hold it," Evans said. "He was holding it since 1953."

Mason leaves his wife, Ann Miller Mason, and a sister, Mrs. Baldwin H. P. Terry of Boston. The Masons had no children. Funeral arrangements were incomplete last night.

CULVER MILITARY ACADEMY'S BLACK HORSE TROOP TO PARADE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the forthcoming participation by the Black Horse Troop of Culver Military Academy in this year's inaugural parade.

Located in Culver, Ind., the Culver Military Academy maintains the largest and one of the finest equestrian units in the United States. Its famous Black Horse Troop will be leading the parade with a showing of the colors of 60 American flags surrounded by a sabre guard. The Clock, the 28-year-old lead horse

of the Culver unit, has been taken out of retirement to lead the troop. This will be the fifth consecutive inaugural parade for The Clock, and it will be the seventh in 60 years in which the Culver unit has participated.

Ninety teenage riders will take part in this historic event, and each of them will be playing a role in the history of our country as well as in the history of Culver Academy. Indeed, the inauguration of a President is one of the great traditions in our heritage of freedom and democratic government. I wish to commend the students of Culver Academy for the part that they will continue to play in this fine tradition.

THE CHILEAN REVOLUTION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent book review by Rev. Joseph F. Thorning that recently appeared in the Fordham University Quarterly. After a careful reading of this book review, Mr. Speaker, I would especially like to call my colleagues' attention to Reverend Thorning's efforts toward the cause of inter-American understanding. With this in mind, I submit the review of the book by Régis Débray entitled "The Chilean Revolution." The review follows:

[From the Fordham University Quarterly, Thought, Winter 1972-73]

THE CHILEAN REVOLUTION
(Reviewed by Régis Débray)

Will the Chilean Revolution be a "revolution without rifles"? That is one of the many interesting questions posed by Régis Débray, a youthful French journalist, in his dialogue with President Salvador Allende Gossens.

Debray's first adventure in the Western Hemisphere was as an ardent admirer of Fidel Castro. In Cuba Régis met Che Guevara. When the latter tried to overthrow the Bolivian Government in 1967, Debray wanted to serve as a combatant in the guerrilla force. He was assured by Guevara that "informing world opinion" was more important than actual fighting. After Che's failure, capture and death, Régis was tried and sentenced to prison. Upon release, he left Bolivia for Chile, resuming his role as a spokesman for rebellion. Favorably impressed by Allende's Marxist program, he became a disciple of the Chilean leader. This book reveals to what an extent the two self-styled revolutionaries understand and trust each other.

In an introductory sketch, historical in nature, Debray claims that the Christian Democrats, led by the then President Eduardo Frei Montalva (1964-70), "raised the level of social aspirations" among workers and the middle class. When Radomiro Tomic, one of the founders of Christian Democracy and the nominee of his Party for President in 1970, campaigned on a platform clearly more radical than that of the Socialist-Communist coalition, he became an "objective and personal ally of the *Unidad Popular* candidate [Allende], behind the back and even against the will of his own government apparatus." Many Chileans would agree with that analysis, although they know how exaggerated is Debray's assertion that Allende won a "majority" of the popular vote. His percentage was exactly 36.3. The narrow margin of victory explains why Allende, as President,

does not see fit to call for a national plebiscite with a view to securing the control he promised to establish over the legislative and judicial branches of government.

In the question-and-answer part of the book, Debray challenges President Allende upon every major principle of domestic and foreign policy. In his replies the chief executive does not equivocate. He proclaims that his "objective is total, scientific, Marxist socialism." His models for imitation, but with a Chilean ethos, are "the Socialist countries." This means that his goal is "complete economic and political domination." As often as Régis expresses impatience with "the pace of socialization," his mentor emphasizes his determination to "expropriate the means of production that are still in private hands." Moreover, Allende insists that his Marxism has "nothing to do with European Social Democrats."

Pointing out that Chilean workers "have theoretically become owners of the factories or the land where they work," the President expects that they will automatically provide an abundance of goods to be enjoyed by all. Such declarations inspire Debray with immense confidence. He describes the chief executive as "an experienced, pragmatic, and intuitive tactician." Force is not ruled out by Allende as a means to his end. Now that he is operating on "the strategic heights of state power," he can select the short-range tactics suitable for the transformation of administrative authority into a position of absolute power. Both Allende and Debray quote with approval the following principle first enunciated by V. I. Lenin: "... Leninism has nothing against compromises, as long as tactical compromises serve as a useful means in the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat, as long as they are absolutely necessary and do not jeopardize the long-term development of the class struggle."

No longer does Debray, somewhat ungrammatically, have to ask two vital questions: "Who is using who?" and "Who is taking who for a ride?" Adolph Hitler, in writing and publishing his original, unexpurgated edition of *Mein Kampf*, could scarcely have been more candid than Salvador Allende in his "Conversations" with Régis Debray. Their colloquy, with only a few ambiguities, supplies that public with a blueprint for another totally collectivized society.

Debray, although providing some "Notes" on Chilean political parties and personalities, apparently did not deem an index essential to his purpose. English versions of the Spanish texts are the work of three different translators. The results, although awkward in spots, are reasonably clear and readable.

JOSEPH F. THORNING,

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OMB DIRECTOR SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY SENATE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation in the House today that would require the confirmation by the Senate for the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Today, the Director of OMB is a budgetary czar and probably more powerful than any Cabinet member.

In order for the Congress effectively to oversee the workings of the executive branch, congressional committees should

have the opportunity to interrogate him regularly and also to confirm his appointment.

In the past, Mr. Weinberger, the former Director of OMB, has appeared before congressional committees. But the possibility exist that Mr. Ash, the new Director of OMB, will evoke executive privilege and thus evade testifying before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the office of Director of OMB, he should be confirmed by the Senate and his work regularly scrutinized by congressional committees.

NATIONAL INCONVENIENCED SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would grant a congressional charter to the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association. NISA is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization which will require no congressional appropriations and is not involved in lobbying activity of any kind. The sole purpose of NISA is to develop and carry out therapeutic sports activities for the millions of physically and neurologically disadvantaged persons in this country.

My bill was passed by unanimous consent by the House of Representatives during the second session of the 92d Congress, but became a victim of legislative inaction in the Senate as the session ended last fall. No opposition was ever voiced to the measure in either Chamber; it simply was a victim of the end-of-session legislative crunch.

The need for a nationwide therapeutic sports program to help rehabilitate persons who suffer from various abnormalities is paramount. While no congressional moneys are at stake in chartering the organization, NISA badly needs the kind of national coordination that chartering by Congress will give.

The National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association is a nonprofit corporation formed exclusively for the following purposes. To provide veterans and others an opportunity to experience sports as a recreational activity in which they can participate; to afford a natural environment which has psychological, therapeutic, and positive results; to develop a nucleus of instructors to enable all disadvantaged persons—amputees, blind, deaf, neurologically damaged—to lead more complete and enjoyable lives.

Traditionally programs of assistance for handicapped Americans are oriented toward: medical aid; formal education; is being done to enable those persons to though numerous national organizations exist to support the inconvenienced, little invaluable psychological therapy derived. Sports participation has provided many counseling; and financial assistance. All people the psychological vehicle to re-take part in sports activity and realize the turn from the point of traumatic depres-

sion to healthy, productive citizenry. The opportunity for thousands of needy Americans, be they amputees, blind, deaf, or neurologically damaged, to have an equal chance is everyone's responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, 10,800,000 Americans suffer disabling injuries each year, with some 400,000 of those receiving some degree of permanent injury. The impairment ranges from partial loss of the use of limbs to blindness or complete crippling. In addition to those substantial domestic totals, the Korean and Vietnam wars have produced over 35,000 amputees, 4,500 blind, 3,500 deaf, and 3,000 neurologically damaged. Various forms of insurance and aid programs take care of the medical, educational, counseling, and financial needs of most of those so disabled, but there is no concrete program to help disadvantaged Americans psychologically over the long period of time after they leave the care of a hospital.

The National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association is already working on a pilot program for each State and some specific community programs, designed to establish regional sports programs which will not only provide inconvenienced sportsmen with activity, but serve as leadership training centers. The organization serves by providing individual chapters across the country with communication through newsletters, correspondence, films, tapes, and other audiovisual materials; conducting regional workshops, training sessions and clinics for instructors in various sports activities; cooperative fund raising activities; establishing equipment sharing pools; assisting in the evaluation and development of individual sports programs and developing teaching guides and manuals. All of these activities are carried out with money raised through contributions from individual Americans.

We need the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association to expand and broaden its current, admirable work so that millions of Americans who do not have the opportunity to live fuller lives, can realize a world many of them have been forced out of by the misfortunes of birth or time. I am introducing my bill, on behalf of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, an organization of, by, and for disadvantaged Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my bill in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

LIST OF SPONSORS

A bill introduced by Shoup with Rarick, Schneebeli, Rhodes, Ichord, Roybal, Gude, Hicks, Lehman, Nichols, Williams, Davis (South Carolina), Fountain, Preyer, Clancy, Martin (North Carolina), Casey, Quile, Won Pat, Symms, Roncallo, Yatron, Wolff, Veysey.

A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Douglas Pringle, Daniel McPherson, and Jim Winters, the present directors and officers of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California), and their associates and successors, are created in the District of Columbia a body

incorporate by the name of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this Act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to do whatever acts as may be necessary to complete the organization of the corporation.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 3. (a) The purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to provide veterans and others who are inconvenienced persons an opportunity to experience sports as a recreational activity in which they may participate;

(2) to afford a frequent natural sports environment for inconvenienced persons which has positive psychological and therapeutic results; and

(3) to develop a nucleus of sports programs and competent instructors to carry the program throughout the Nation.

(b) As used in this section the term "inconvenienced persons" includes amputees, blind persons, and persons who are neurologically damaged.

POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) Subject to all applicable laws of the United States, and of any State in which the corporation operates, the corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal for the sole and exclusive use of the corporation;

(3) to adopt, alter, or amend bylaws not inconsistent with this charter;

(4) to contract and to be contracted with;

(5) to acquire, control, hold, lease, and dispose of such real, personal, or mixed property as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(6) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes; and

(7) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the corporate purposes.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be set forth in the bylaws of the corporation.

GOVERNING AUTHORITY OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 6. (a) The corporation shall have a national board of directors as may be provided for in the bylaws of the corporation.

(b) Qualifications of directors on any national board of directors created for the corporation, the manner of selection of such directors, terms of office of directors on the board, and the powers and responsibilities of the board and its directors shall be set forth in the bylaws of the corporation.

OFFICERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation shall be those provided for in the bylaws of the corporation. Such officers shall be elected in such manner, for such terms, and with such powers and responsibilities, as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 8. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be in Sacramento, California, or in such other place as may later be determined by the corporation, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to

that place, but may be conducted throughout the United States and all other locations as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept services of process for the corporation. Service upon, or notice mailed to the business address of, such agent shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the assets or income of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, officers, directors, or employees.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation and its officers and directors as such shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of proceedings of its members, board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law" approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1102, 1103), shall apply with respect to the corporation.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with this Act, the bylaws of the corporation, and all other Federal and State laws, and the laws of the District of Columbia applicable thereto.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 16. The corporation may acquire the assets of the existing organization of the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association, a nonprofit corporation chartered in the State of California upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all the liabilities of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of California applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF THE RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

TONGUES OF BRASS, FEET OF CLAY

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, James S. Kemper, Jr., president of Kemper Insurance Group, recently discussed consumerism in this country and some of the key components of this movement.

I found Mr. Kemper's remarks of extreme interest and I want to take this opportunity to share them with you.

Therefore, I am including at this point the text of Mr. Kemper's address, given on December 7, 1972, before the annual conferment luncheon of the Rochester chapter of Chartered Property and Casualty Underwriters:

TONGUES OF BRASS, FEET OF CLAY

Modern consumerism, which I would define as a broad-based and diverse movement to improve the quality of life, is an outgrowth of the affluent, highly-industrialized society. It has achieved the stature of a movement only in the United States, although consumerism is beginning to appear in prosperous countries such as Canada, West Germany and Japan.

Hungry nations have no time for it: they are too busy trying to develop resources and product goods to worry about undesirable side-effects. West Germany is a case in point. The West Germans turned the Rhine into an industrial sewer while they were struggling to rebuild after World War II, but now that their economic goals have been achieved they are trying to clean up the river.

Consumerism in this country takes many forms: improving the physical environment, preserving natural resources, encouraging manufacturers to make better and safer products and service organizations to provide better and cheaper services, protecting buyers from being cheated, investigating, and defending individuals against misuses of power by government agencies, unions and corporations; and the like. There is no limit to the variety of activities which collectively have come to be known as consumerism.

Consumerism has become a major factor in the insurance business. Its biggest achievement so far has been to plant firmly in the minds of the public and politicians that every person has the right to buy insurance at an affordable price, thus overturning basic principles of risk and rating which have existed for centuries. Other consumerism interests have involved such things as credit reports, auto insurance systems, health care and financing, and safety in many forms. I am not going to discuss the merits of these and other insurance-related consumer issues now. But, for better or for worse, the consumerists have taken a great interest in us, and it behooves us to pay equal attention to them, as I propose to do in this talk.

The consumer movement was born, or reborn, after World War II as America turned its attention to internal matters. A movement requires leadership, and there are countless fine examples. I will mention just a few.

I suppose the first great consumer advocate was Consumers Union, which, from small beginnings, became and still is the most generally reliable and professional of all the voices purporting to speak for the consumer as purchaser. Through its monthly publication, *Consumer Reports*, and in other ways, it keeps us informed of the usefulness, safety and price/value relationship of thousands of products and services. Consumers Union performs a public service of incalculable

value, and it does so with strict adherence to professional standards in its research and objectivity in its findings and recommendations.

In the field of our physical environment, the Sierra Club exemplifies zeal combined with as much objectivity as you can reasonably expect from zealous people. Government agencies and natural resource companies contend that not all of the positions taken by the Sierra Club are justified or practical, but nobody can be right all of the time, and the Sierra Club has maintained a notably good success ratio in environmental litigation it has undertaken. It is a good consumerist organization, with a productive blend of professional and volunteer workers.

There are hundreds of small, *ad hoc* groups working effectively in the consumer movement. All over the United States young lawyers have established store-front law offices to provide legal services to poor people at nominal fees. Consumer action groups organize and go into battle in local disputes involving everything from expressway construction to preservation of streams to meat prices in the corner supermarket.

White House Office of Consumer Affairs and government agencies operate over a wide range of consumer and environmental issues: the Food and Drug Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Trade Commission, and many others at both the federal and state level. These agencies, like all government, tend to become sterile and bureaucratic as respects new ideas, they move ponderously, and they lack the vigor that comes with enthusiasm, but they do a necessary and useful job.

In our own industry, where I have more specific knowledge and experience, we do far more consumer-oriented things than we get credit for, although I personally believe we are still not doing as much as we should. Individual companies have spent millions of dollars to foster safety on the highways and at the workplace, to develop better rehabilitation techniques for accident victims, to rehabilitate the emotionally ill, and to improve the general quality of life. Individually and through our trade associations, and most particularly through the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, we have made our own significant contribution to the consumer movement. And much that I hear and read convinces me that American corporate management as a whole is increasingly accepting its responsibility to participate in, rather than to resist, the consumer movement.

I may sound like a Pollyanna, with something nice to say about everyone. I know there are many things wrong in our society. There will be fat targets for the consumerists long after you and I are gone. There will always be shortchangers and cheats, polluters and venal politicians, businessmen and union leaders without conscience. Every one of us needs an ongoing consumer movement to help us maintain the high standards society has the right to expect of us. But I am just sick and tired of all these smart-ass people who get money and publicity out of blasting away at American institutions, and I think that once in a while it's a good idea to take note of the fact that most of the victims of these attacks are trying very hard to do a conscientious job with due regard for the national welfare.

What I have been leading up to is that I think the consumer movement is becoming a national movement. It is beginning to lose its adversary characteristics. It is becoming participative. Corporations compete with each other in social activism. Unions spend ever larger budget allocations on community services. Government bureaus have become planning centers for preservation of natural resources. There is a national will to improve the quality of life.

Part, but only a small part, of the credit for the developing national character of consumerism should be given to the gadflies of the movement who cut and slashed their way to national attention in the late 1960's. Most of the credit belongs to the basic decency and sense of fairness of most Americans, and to organizations of the type I have mentioned. With our foreign relationships on the mend and the profligate adventure in Vietnam drawing to a close, we are in a position to bring the full force of our ingenuity and economic power to bear upon the quality of life in our society. Consumerism is a uniquely American undertaking, consistent with our greatest traditions, and its time is now.

Who will be the leaders of a national consumer movement? The question is crucial because the caliber and character of leadership will determine whether the movement builds on a solid foundation or becomes mainly a platform for power-seekers and publicity hounds.

I have managed to get this far without mentioning Ralph Nader, at least by name, which is probably some kind of a record for a speech on consumerism, but I need to spend a little time now on Naderism. Naderism represents a style of leadership which can wreck the consumer movement.

Mr. Nader wrote a book on unsafe automobiles in 1965. Shortly after its publication he became a national figure. This did not happen due to the merits of the book, which to a considerable extent merely elaborated upon the research of scientists in that field going all the way back to the work of Hugh DeHaven (*War Medicine*, July 1942), and including exhaustive research and publications by the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. William Haddon, and others. Mr. Nader became a national figure because he packaged his material more attractively than did his predecessors in the auto safety field, not because of the superior quality of the goods in his package, which were, in fact, rather inferior. An old trick, well known to hucksters. Then came the lucky chance which enabled him to become an alleged victim of corporate espionage, and Mr. Nader became martyr and hero.

I think Mr. Nader has performed a useful service, in a limited sense, in the same way that a fine actor may get people interested in reading fine plays. Mr. Nader did get people interested in consumerism. The point is that we should not confuse the actor with the playwright, and we should never expect the actor to write a good play. Naderism is not a substantive movement, it is not consumerism. It is playacting on a national stage by an actor of great skill and charisma.

And that is all it is. Consider what has happened in the past few years. Lionized by students and by the hungry and gullible media, Nader has become a self-acknowledged expert on everything. He is the keeper of the corporate conscience. He is a self-styled expert on ecology and antitrust law, pollution and proxy statements, safety and suppression of information, forestry and political campaigns, et cetera, et cetera, no matter what. The dominant fact that emerges from the spread of Naderism into every facet of our lives is that its founder has become fascinated with power and publicity and has lost his way in the process.

Consider the record. In the fall of 1971, Nader published a 15-month, 900-page study of California land use called "Power and Land in California." The purpose was to prove that greedy landowners controlled the state government and victimized the people of the state. *Newsweek* reported that "the study group's single-minded determination to 'get the interests' often resulted in certain sacrifices of objectivity. . . . The report undoubtedly suffers from an overdose of indignation and an overzealous helping of reform that detracts from its solid research." *Time*

described some of the charges in the report as "tenuous, since they are based on the shadowy history of 19th century land grants." Thus did Mr. Nader's friends of the press evaluate the caliber of study and research behind a document designed to destroy the reputations of those whom it attacked.

Nader unleashed another group of young zealots on the First National City Bank of New York. In a talk last month before the Executives Club of Chicago, Ralph Lewis, Editor and Publisher of *Harvard Business Review*, commented: "For instance, I happen to know a fair amount about First National City Bank of New York, and that was one company his (Nader's) boys studied, and that was a thoroughly miserable report. It indicated the kids that did the job did not understand the banking business. It was just awful."

The most ambitious project of Nader's Raiders was the recent Congress Project, consisting of a paperback called *Who Runs Congress?* followed by lengthy profiles of individual members of Congress. As expected, there was little pretense to objectivity. The *New York Times* (October 22) said, as respects the profiles: "When opinions of the writer crept in, as they often did, they usually reflected a liberal point of view. . . . Complimentary opinions of liberals were sprinkled through many of the profiles." Business trade associations were described as forming the "anti-consumer axis," while union pressures were described as "social progress lobbying."

Vulnerable as the Congress Project clearly is, the most illuminating part of the story relates to Nader's personal involvement in the Project. For the following facts I am indebted to one of the world's most anti-establishment publications, the *Harvard Law Record*, and in particular to its News Editor, one Daniel M. Taubman. You should understand that this campus newspaper has been an adoring supporter of Nader for many years, and that a high percentage of his so-called Raiders are students or recent graduates of Harvard Law School, an institution whose position in the mainstream of American society can be judged from the fact that in a pre-election poll 83% of the students and 90% of the faculty voted for Senator McGovern.

According to Mr. Taubman, who was himself a writer on the Congress Project, (*Record*, October 20), on the first Saturday in June, 60 of Nader's Raiders assembled in a lounge at George Washington University for their initial meeting and briefing by Mr. Nader. At the outset a Project director, Bob Fellmeth, 1970 Harvard Law graduate (who had directed the biased California land study) "asked whether anyone from the press was present. Greeted with silence, he then queried whether anyone not associated with the Congress Project was present." Two such interlopers were found—a young man who was there because his girl invited him, and a girl who was working on another Nader project. Fellmeth, acting as bouncer, threw both of them out.

Then, secrecy having supposedly been assured, Nader addressed the group. I quote Taubman: "He exhorted us to emulate him, to follow him in carrying the Protestant work ethic to its ultimate conclusion. . . . Don't use drugs, because we have to be above any kind of inquiry or suspicion. Don't wear sandals. . . . And, above all, you must be willing to sacrifice long hair or your personal mode of dress for interviews with Congressmen and staff personnel." Thus did the advocate of honesty and full disclosure instruct his followers to practice deception as a part of the "Protestant work ethic."

To continue. Taubman goes on to describe the Project as plagued by "errors of miscalculation, as well as single-minded leadership." Nader refused to revise work assignments, even when students protested they could not each write nine 30-page

profiles plus do the research in three months. Then he changed his mind and reduced the work-load, but because of poor planning it was necessary to hire more writers, who then proceeded to defect in large numbers. At the last minute, over vigorous protest by a majority of his workers, Nader unilaterally decreed that a paperback, which Taubman describes as a "leaser" and a "quickie book," be written to induce people to buy the profiles to be released later on. Nader met with his troops, listened to their protests. Says Taubman: "As he had kept his ground with profile writers, so too with the committee and topics researchers: We are writing a quickie book, that's that. Now, does anyone have any questions?"

Taubman, his ideals badly battered, concludes the story: "It was as if Mount Rushmore had crumbled," a Harvard Law School student said after attending the meeting. The student's image of Nader had been shattered."

Why have I used so many words and so much of your time discussing these last three Nader projects? I have no need or desire to attack Ralph Nader *per se*. I have debated him, I have joined him in supporting consumer legislation in the auto field, he has always been cordial to me and I to him. But there is a danger here and it has to be looked at. The danger is Naderism, and the character and quality of leadership exemplified by Naderism.

The man who began his public career as a crusading author and publicist in a narrow field has become one of the most powerful men in America. His influence is enormous. He has the electronic and print media so much at his disposal that it is as if he owned them. Powerful legislators give him immediate audience. He now deals with the most corrupting of all the devils—Power. And he appears to have fallen heir to the same arrogance, prejudice, dishonesty, irresponsibility and shoddy performance of which he accuses his targets. The hunter has acquired the characteristics of his prey.

Ralph Nader has a standard speech, which he first gave before the National Press Club in December 1966, called "Taming the Corporate Tiger." In it he delineates crimes of omission and commission by corporations. The title itself discloses his objective, which is to liken corporations to a fierce and frightening beast. In this talk he charges corporations with shoddy performance, irresponsibility, repression of criticism and having too much power. He proposes a National Commission on Corporate Reform to study such corporate abuses, and he suggests several avenues it might pursue.

I think that as part of the burgeoning of consumerism into a truly national movement, there should be established a National Commission of Consumerism. It should have broad representation from all segments of society, and should be charged with the task of investigating and periodically auditing any consumer organization considered by it to be exercising a significant influence upon the national economy or upon any association or group or industry. Somebody can think up better and more comprehensive language, but I think the general idea is clear enough. Such a commission might also develop standards leading to a university course of study with a graduate degree of Doctor of Consumerism, so that the public could distinguish the output of these raider-types, whose sole credential is their hatred of the status quo, from the work of the real professionals.

Another logical step would be to give the new federal Consumer Protection Agency, soon to be created, the direct responsibility for surveillance of consumer organizations and their methods of operation. Hunting down and shooting corporate tigers may be a permissible activity, but somebody ought to issue the hunting license

and see to it that the hunters don't shoot up the whole neighborhood.

By way of conclusion:

1. Consumerism is here to stay.
2. The consumerism movement is a healthy development and is rapidly maturing into a movement of national and ecumenical scope.
3. Some consumerists have become dangerous and irresponsible in the usage of great power. Techniques should be derived to professionalize and exercise the balance of the practitioners in this field, for the protection of society and the benefit of the movement itself.

THE LATEST JUDICIAL AFFRONT TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as Congress mobilizes to restore the powers of Government to the constitutional intent and concept, I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to the latest violation of constitutional government—this instance by the judicial branch.

Last night's Washington paper carried an interesting picture of U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger examining the Yugoslav "Order of the Flag with Three Colors," an honor presented to him by the Yugoslavian Ambassador Toma Granfil. Yugoslavia, as I am sure all are aware, is a Communist country under the control of the red dictator General Tito.

Apparently the Chief Justice, like some of his predecessors, is unfamiliar with the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution, article 1, section 9, clause 8, reads:

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

There has been no act of Congress authorizing either the Chief Justice or the other recipients of a similar award, Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Superior Court, William S. Thompson, and District of Columbia attorney, Charles Rhyne, to accept such presents or emolument.

The reason for granting this award is reported to have been because of Chief Justice Burger's important role at the Belgrade Conference of the World Peace Through Law meetings, "perhaps as a reflection of people's desire to have their international life governed more by international law."

Elected and appointed officials of our Government, on taking office, take an oath to preserve and defend the Constitution. There can be no activity by a U.S. official which advances international life under international law which does not destroy or erode the Constitution of the United States.

This is judicial indiscretion without even raising the taxpayers question of when do these busy "one-world" Federal judges find the time to junket over the

world to attend these international judicial meetings.

When there is a constitutional conflict which involves the Chief Justice of the United States who resolves the issue? Are we now to permit our judicial branch to assume powers prohibited all U.S. officials?

Portions of the newscipping follow:

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 15, 1973]

PARTYING FOR THE TEAM

(By Ymelda Dixon)

Saturday night, when Yugoslav Ambassador and Mrs. Granfil gave a black-tie dinner on the occasion of the presentation of the Order of the Yugoslav Flag to Chief Justice Warren Burger, the endemic disease, Redskins fever, invaded the stately R Street embassy.

"Radios and televisions do not work in the Supreme Court Building," said the chief justice.

In presenting the awards to Burger and to Associate Judge of the D.C. Superior Court William S. Thompson and D.C. attorney Charles S. Rhyne, Ambassador Granfil commented on the chief justice's important role at the Belgrade Conference of the World Peace Through Law meetings, "perhaps as a reflection of people's desire to have their international life governed more by international law."

"Charles Rhyne," said Granfil, "had the idea for this movement in the first place; and Justice Thompson also made a large contribution to the Belgrade conference."

Thompson had flown back from the Ivory Coast, where he is setting up the next meeting of World Peace Through Law, in time to be at the dinner and to watch yesterday's football classic.

Other diners watching the presentations were Mrs. Richard G. Kleindienst, whose husband, the attorney general, was lecturing in Cleveland; Mexican Ambassador Olloqui, whose President Echeverria will visit Yugoslavia this year and Rep. and Mrs. Philip Ruppe of Michigan.

Of Ruppe, Granfil said, "We welcome on the legal territory of Yugoslavia, a man with Slovenian blood in his veins. We are hopeful that the wine and Yugoslav hospitality will be temptation for him to visit the old country for the first time."

FARMERS FACING FORECLOSURE FOR LACK OF FHA LOANS

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of curtailments of programs and the impoundment of funds by the President will touch all of us. None are being harder hit than the farmers of this Nation and none of the cuts have been more cruel than those announced by the Department of Agriculture. The following article, by Mr. Lee Egerstrom of the Washington Ridder News Bureau, clearly describes the seriousness of just one of the canceled programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call special attention to the evaluation of the Secretary of Agriculture by the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM):

Butz has become a good after dinner speaker with a joke for all occasions. But

what we want is a Secretary, some facts and some action.

This, Mr. Speaker, reflects the view of most of us who have the honor to represent rural America:

FORECLOSING MORTGAGES
(By Lee Egerstrom)

WASHINGTON.—Paul Dorweiler is a president of a small bank in Chokio, Minn., that has been pretty generous over the years to keep his little community intact with the financing he can provide. But this week he is confronted with the thought of foreclosing mortgages on five of his community's farmers.

"These are not the small farmers who couldn't make it on the farm under any circumstances," Dorweiler said. "These are good, solid citizens; good, efficient farmers who have been cheated."

The foreclosures are being forced by the administration's decision to kill off the emergency Farmers Home Administration (FHA) loans authorized by the last Congress in the wake of natural disasters stretching from Rapid City, S.D., to the east coast.

Farmers in the western areas of Minnesota around Chokio, like farmers in eastern South Dakota, northwestern Wisconsin and much of northern Minnesota, southeastern Ohio and endless other places, all qualified for the expanded provisions of the "Hurricane Agnes" act.

The act, signed by the president, allows emergency loans from the FHA at low interest and contains a \$5,000 forgiveness feature for farmers who had severe damage.

The same benefits were given to rural areas of Oklahoma. Farms and ranches there were stricken with drought.

What irritates Dorweiler, and the congressmen who represent these wet and dry farmlands, is how the department of agriculture announced at Christmas time that the emergency loan program was over.

Farmers were told to wait until what little crops they had were harvested to determine the extent of their losses before they applied for aid," said Rep. Robert Bergland, D-Minn., who represents Chokio's congressional district.

"Now they have been told that if they followed these directions they waited too long and now they are no longer eligible," the congressman said. "We can't even estimate the number of farms that will be lost through this action."

Dorweiler is quite sure what the cost will be to his community, because he holds bank notes on most area farms.

"What happens is that these farmers may have about \$40,000 loans to start with," he said. "Every spring they come in and borrow another \$30,000 which drives their total obligations up to about \$70,000."

"Then, in the fall after harvest, they come in and pay off the \$30,000 plus their payment on the other loan."

"These farmers aren't going to pay off that loan this fall because they had no harvest," he said. "I went to the big banks in Minneapolis and St. Paul where I 'farm' out part of the loans and I explained to them what was happening. They said they would be patient and wait a year on the loans, but what will these farmers do next spring to get started. They have no credit left and they won't be able to buy seed, fertilizer, anything. They're through, plain and simple."

"The folks up north were getting all the rain this year and we couldn't buy water," complained an aide to Rep. Tom Steed, D-Okla., who represents the drought-stricken farmers.

"Does the program cuts affect us? Nobody knows what they're going to do," he said. "This is a disaster."

An Ohio congressman, usually in agreement with the Nixon administration, uttered

similar words in describing his farmers' predicament who were affected by excessive rainfall.

"The wrong ax fell at the wrong time," said Rep. Clarence Miller.

And the problem of emergency loans, or lack of them, is now being felt in northern California, according to a Fresno congressman.

B. F. (Bernie) Sisk, D-Calif., represents Fresno County, the largest agricultural producing county in the United States. The dairy industry has been having trouble acquiring feed with the high cost of feed grain and the shortage of it in California following the huge grain sales to the Soviet Union this summer.

Like Rep. David Obey, D-Wis., Sisk's office was preparing emergency legislation to allow shipment of government-held feed grain and hay to his area, on a low-cost emergency basis.

But an aide to Sisk said Friday that a new dilemma for northern California agriculture has just come to light. Fresno citrus growers have just had the worst frost in 40 years, he said, and this comes on the heels of a frost last year that limited the crop.

"We were writing legislation to submit that would have included our citrus growers in the disaster emergency program," the aide said. "Now there is no program."

The ax, as described by congressman Miller, is dropping. By the close of the week the White House had brought it down on the space industry.

President Nixon is hellbent to keep federal spending under the guidelines for a national deficit approved by the last Congress.

Non-priority items are the first to go, and it appeared to a growing number of farm-bloc congressman that agriculture is not a high-priority item in this administration.

The ax the agriculture department has been wielding at low-cost rural electrification loans, FHA loans, conservation programs and rural development programs. In addition, the department announced that it was calling in most stored grains to avoid storage costs—much of which goes to farmers—because the grain is needed on the market.

The scuttling of the programs has had an unusual effect of bringing the farm bloc congressmen in their ever decreasing numbers to become a closer knit unit than congress usually is.

Criticism of the department's slashing has created a bipartisan voice of opposition, while congress generally prepares to take on the administration in a tug-of-war for power.

The farm program cuts came first, although many more are expected to follow. The farm bloc organized first.

This could set the stage for the showdown congress is pledging the administration in what congressional leaders call a "power grab" by the executive branch.

Rep. Frank Denholm, D-S.D., considers cutting programs spelled out and funded by congress to be illegal. He believes court tests, already in Missouri on frozen highway funds, will uphold congress' "power of the purse strings."

Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz announced publicly and told members of both the Senate and the House that farm income, reaching \$19 billion this year, has farmers "happy" and that they can now afford some of the programs that were stopped by the administration's directives.

The emergency loan program was cancelled by Butz himself, he said, because "it was being grossly abused."

The secretary cited an example of a blanket fire insurance on a college fraternity's house. Before the fire five boys had tuxedos and after the fire 20 boys had tuxedos.

"That's pretty sassy talk from the secretary," bitter congressman Denholm said afterwards.

"Butz has become a good after dinner speaker with a joke for all occasions," he said. "But what we want, is a secretary, some facts and some actions."

Denholm's district is faring better than most affected by wet or dry fields. He had thought the appropriation was insignificant to cover the need and had advised his farmers to apply for the loans early before congress would need to fret over supplemental appropriations.

In two meetings in his district to explain that concern, more than 1,000 farmers showed up and the first district of South Dakota has a high average of approved applications.

"But there are still good, honest people out there who waited to see what their yield would be before they applied," he said. "These people are being hurt while their neighbors down the road already have their money. This doesn't make sense."

Both Bergland and banker Dorweiler complained that the cutoff was too abrupt.

Dorweiler said he attended FHA sponsored meetings "and I have a tape of their telling our farmers not to apply until they could measure their losses."

"Well, on the wet fields around here, the farmers had to wait until the ground was frozen before they could work through the cornfields in the snow and try to harvest some grain."

The announcement of the emergency loan program's cancellation was two weeks ago. The effective date was Sept. 27.

SEND OIL SUPPLY COMMITTEE
MEETING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, despite the welcome announcement by the White House on Wednesday, January 17, 1973, that the fuel oil import quotas are being suspended until April 30, 1973, there remains the serious crisis as to what will occur following that date regarding the supply of heating oils and other petroleum products for the United States.

I regard the removal of import quotas on heating oils announcement by the White House as only a very temporary relief measure and I further believe, as I am sure many of the Members of both the House of Representatives and Senate do, that much more than just a suspension must occur if there is to be a sufficient oil supply for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House and the Members of the Senate to the following printed copy of a letter each Member of Congress has received from the National Oil Jobbers Council regarding the scheduled Tuesday, January 23, 1973, "Send Oil Supply Committee" meeting.

I include the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members and citizens:

NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1973.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: As you know the current energy deficit has resulted in a full scale crisis with respect to the supply

of heating oil. In many sections of the country schools have been closed, factories have stopped their operations and even homes have gone unheated.

For several years now many of us have predicted the present crisis. Currently, both refiners and federal agencies assure us of their best efforts and intentions. However, one fact is inescapable—the shortage persists and continues to worsen. Corrective action must be taken AT ONCE. Merely tampering with the various factors of the supply situation is clearly not adequate to the desperate circumstances faced by consumers and industry in many sections of the country. A special SOS (Send Oil Supply) Committee, consisting of local consumer and government spokesmen and small business fuel oil marketers, has been formed to brief you and your colleagues concerning the dimensions and nature of the current crisis, together with suggested solutions.

On January 23, in the Caucus Room of the Cannon House Office Building, at the hour of 10:00 a.m., a briefing session will be held. The agenda will be compact. On behalf of consumers and oil marketers from your area, you are urgently requested to attend this meeting. Should prior commitments make this impossible, it would be most helpful if you could send the appropriate member of your staff. It is anticipated that representatives from both the national press and other communications media will be covering this meeting. Press coverage for your region will also be present. Your presence and cooperation can make known your concern and interest regarding this problem which is of such vital importance to your constituency.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. GREENES,
President.

HILBERT FEFFERMAN

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this month a distinguished civil servant will retire from the Department of Housing and Urban Development after 31 years of outstanding Government service.

Hilbert Fefferman joined one of the original predecessor agencies of HUD in 1941, and most recently has served that Department as Associate General Counsel for Legislation. In his capacity he has borne primary legal responsibility for the development of legislation for this country's major housing and urban development programs. Indeed, he personally handled the extensive and difficult legislative work which resulted in the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1965. In 1962, Mr. Fefferman had the key role of drafting Executive Order 11063, which for the first time conferred equal opportunity rights with respect to occupancy in Government-assisted housing. His contributions included the negotiation and resolution, within the executive branch, of legal obstacles to equal housing opportunity. His resolution of these problems laid the foundation for, and served as a guide to, later extensive legislation enacted in the field of civil rights.

If any single member of the executive branch could be singled out as "Mr. New

Communities" it would be Hilbert Fefferman. For over 10 years he has been at the center of both policymaking and drafting of all Federal legislation relating to land development and new communities.

Mr. Fefferman's exercise of his consummate skills has not been restricted to the legal area. For many years he has been recognized as the outstanding trouble shooter to whom the department and predecessor agencies have turned to care for some of the most critical problems. For example, in 1954, Mr. Fefferman was given a central role in the emergency management of the Federal Housing Administration during the congressional investigation of the war housing mortgage insurance program.

In 1956, he was primarily responsible for reconciling the widely divergent and conflicting positions of housing officials—who then had semi-independent authority—on policies for the mortgage insurance program for moderate income housing in urban renewal areas and the new urban renewal program itself. His actions were critical to getting these major programs underway.

Mr. Fefferman's accomplishments have won for him many expressions of appreciation from his fellow officials and commendations from his superiors, from other Federal agencies, and from congressional committees. He has been invited from time to time to lecture at the George Washington University and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and has accepted a professorial appointment at MIT following retirement. He has contributed articles on housing to Grolier's International Encyclopedia and to the Duke University Symposium on Urban Renewal.

In 1969, Mr. Fefferman received the highest award of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—its Distinguished Service Award. In conferring this award, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development cited him for his great abilities and major contributions in the fields of housing and urban development, as well as for his unusual patience, cooperation, and objectivity in dealing with his colleagues, which have earned for him a unique and highly respected position in the Department. In 1959, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator nominated Mr. Fefferman for the President's Distinguished Civilian Service Award.

We in the Congress and particularly those of us on the Banking and Currency Committee and its Housing Subcommittee will sorely miss Hilbert Fefferman. Our every request to him for assistance was acted upon with dispatch and skill. He willingly gave his time and ability to Members of Congress and their staffs even when his responsibilities at HUD had pressed an unbelievable workload upon him. Hilbert Fefferman could be found evening after evening, weekend after weekend, holiday after holiday, working with energy and devotion to help solve this Nation's housing problems. While I am personally saddened by his departure, I want to add my best wishes for a deserved retirement and success in his new endeavors.

THE 1972 NICARAGUA EARTHQUAKE DRAMATIZES THE UNSUITABILITY OF THAT SITE FOR AN INTER- OCEANIC CANAL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Central American Isthmus, because of its advantageous geographical location for the construction of pack mule trails, railroads and ship canals, has been recognized as the strategic center of the Western Hemisphere. As the result of the low continental divides and penetration of the jungle by small navigable rivers, Nicaragua and Panama were for many years the two principal competitors for trans-Isthmian transit. In fact, the most favored site by the U.S. Government for an interoceanic canal until 1902 was at Nicaragua.

When the question of canal site came up in the last part of the 19th century for determination by the Congress, both Nicaragua and Panama had strong supporters in the United States but nature intervened. On May 13, 1902, there were serious volcanic disturbances and earthquakes caused by an eruption of Momotombo, an old volcano in Nicaragua. This resulted in the destruction of docks at the town of Momotombo, the terminus of the railroad to Corinto. So dominated by volcanoes did the political scene become that some newspapers described heated political discussions in the Congress as "eruptions."

One of the Panama Canal supporters, understanding that young nations like to place upon their coats of arms what symbolizes their soil, recalled that a Nicaragua postage stamp featured a "beautiful volcano belching forth in magnificent eruption." Buying a supply from a stamp shop in Washington, he distributed copies to all Members of the Congress marked "An official witness of volcanic activity on the Isthmus of Nicaragua." This, together with other factors too involved for recording here, ended with the great decision in 1902 for the Panama site in preference to Nicaragua. More than half a century in the operation of the Panama Canal has demonstrated the soundness of that decision.

The American Isthmus is in a region of seismic activity, earthquakes at Panama have been far less violent than those at Nicaragua as shown by the fact that a flat arch bridge has been standing at Panama for over four centuries. At Nicaragua, the record is not so good, as shown by a severe earthquake in 1931 in which 1,000 persons were killed and \$70,000,000 in property damage sustained; and violent eruption in recent years of the volcano, El Negro.

Just after midnight on December 23, 1972, an earthquake registering 6.5 on the Richter scale struck the city of Managua, Nicaragua. In less than 30 seconds, some 36 blocks in the heart of the nation's capital—or half of the total

city—were practically leveled. Except for a few damaged buildings still standing, what the initial and aftershocks left were 1,200 square acres of rubble in the geometrically exact center of the capital.

We will never know how many died or even how many were injured in the earthquake; estimates of the number killed range between 4,000 and 12,000 and some 20,000 more injured. We do know, however, that the other losses were staggering. Not only was the basic infrastructure of a modern city—electricity, communications, water supply and transport—immediately knocked out, but 50,000 homes were totally destroyed and thousands more made uninhabitable, forcing the survivors into the streets to fend for themselves.

The gigantic dimensions of what was lost soon began to emerge. Gone was all of the physical plant of the National Government; half the public schools in the city; all of its hospitals and practically all of the commercial services, markets and commodity stocks upon which an urban society depends. A preliminary estimate places the immediate losses at over \$600 million. Additionally, almost half of the nation's GNP has been disrupted, more than half of the Government's sources of revenue has been lost, and 25 percent of the population is now without the means to sustain even the minimum necessities of life.

It was my fate to have been in Managua on a visit at that time and thus to have been able to make first-hand observations of the catastrophe.

The destruction was truly indescribable even exceeding that of Berlin, Tokyo, and Manila in World War II. It is appropriate to state that the first to come to the aid of the stricken city were units from the U.S. Southern Command in the Canal Zone, which Panamanian demagogues are trying to eliminate. It is also pertinent to mention that the leadership of Gen. Anastasio Somoza, Jr., a West Point graduate now Commandant of the National Guard of Nicaragua, was highly efficient and in the highest interests of his people.

In spite of the magnitude of the tragedy that I observed I could not resist thinking of its significance as regards the movement for a Nicaraguan Canal, which still has strong advocates not only in Nicaragua, but also in the United States, especially among the special interests that would benefit from such a vast project.

The 1972 earthquake tragedy in Nicaragua emphasizes again the wisdom of the statesmen in our country who resisted the proponents of the Nicaragua site in 1902 and chose Panama as the best site for an interoceanic canal. Moreover, by serving to remove one of the confusing issues from the Isthmian equation, the 1972 Nicaragua earthquake should advance the time when the major modernization of the Panama Canal now before Congress will be authorized.

THE ACTUAL EFFECTS OF REVISING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about the vast improvements to be realized if we will but change some of the rules of the House. One of those drawing attention is the so-called closed rule applied to certain special legislation considered by the House. Do away with the closed rule and better legislation will result, according to the arguments.

We must constantly strive to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of this body, but in considering changes we must look beyond the sloganeering to the actual effect of revisions. The Wall Street Journal did this in an editorial of January 17, expressing the viewpoint that the closed rule may be a significant factor in the ability of the House to discipline itself for responsible decisionmaking. This view merits the consideration of all of us and I include the editorial in the RECORD for the information of all Members:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 17, 1973]

THE ACTUAL EFFECTS OF REVISING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

In taking note of polls that indicate only a scattering of Americans have "confidence" in Congress, those who would reform the institution have two standard proposals to regain the minds and hearts of the people: Get rid of the old men in Congress and get rid of its old rules. Youthfulness and democracy is the ticket.

The would-be reformers have exceptions to this general guideline, of course. One is that elderly members are okay as long as they are willing to get rid of old rules. Another is that old rules are okay if younger members feel they suit their purposes.

Senate Rule XXII, for example, has for a quarter century drawn the fire of reformers. The rule provides for closing debate only upon agreement of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting. This year, though, there's not been a peep from the reformers about this so-called "gag rule." After all, the liberal Democrats have discovered that the filibuster is a useful weapon in dealing with the White House.

On the other hand, reformers are celebrating the retirement of 82-year-old William Colmer of Mississippi and his replacement, as chairman of the House Rules Committee, by a younger man, 80-year-old Ray Madden of Indiana. The difference is that Mr. Colmer favored a "closed rule" for just about any legislation produced by the Ways and Means Committee, chiefly those measures involving taxes, Social Security, and trade. And Mr. Madden is opposed to the closed rule, which simply means he would permit Ways and Means bills to be amended on the House floor.

"There are 435 members of the House of Representatives and 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee," he says, "What this means is that 410 members didn't have a damn thing to say about taxes." His position sounds reasonable enough, but we have serious doubts that eliminating the closed rule would bring about a resurgence of public confidence in Congress. In a way, it amounts

to a transfer of power from 25 Congressmen who have read the tax bill to 410 who haven't.

As it is, the Mills committee will spend weeks and months laboring over a trade-authorization measure or revisions to the Internal Revenue Code. Traditionally, its members stubbornly train their sights on meeting a broad national interest, yet without trampling painfully over special and regional interests. And such is the genius of the committee in packaging intricate compromises that it rarely has its work rejected.

The Senate does not limit itself in amending tax and trade bills that are produced by its Finance Committee. As a result, when such measures reach the Senate floor they are soon festooned with dozens of gaudy amendments, most of them either raids on the U.S. Treasury or protectionist gimmicks. They're called "Christmas tree" bills.

Fortunately for the nation, the fact that the House of Representatives, with its closed rule, passes relatively clean legislation has the effect of neutralizing the nonsense that goes on in the Senate. When the Senate and House conferees gather to work out the differences between their two versions of a tax bill, the first order of business is to pluck the gaudiest of the ornaments from the Senate version and chuck them in the circular file. Nor do the Senate conferees put up much resistance. They are not so dense as to believe that all of what takes place on the Senate floor is serious business.

The sort of charade that goes on in the Senate—not too many old men and old rules—is the reason the public has become increasingly cynical about the ways of Congress. It is by no means obvious that the cure is to reform away the few restraints by which Congress has been able to discipline itself. If Congress yearns for respect it first has to demonstrate that it can act responsibly.

PRESIDENTIAL HOUSING FREEZE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is depressing to witness a President follow his landslide reelection with a decision that will bar thousands of American families from decent housing and will raise the price of existing housing for thousands more. There is no other way to interpret the President's freeze on Federal assistance to homeownership and housing construction.

This is yet another example of the President's propensity to make drastic shifts in national policy and priorities without consulting the Congress. The Congress has spent countless hours over the past few years developing a realistic set of national housing goals and practical programs with which they could be accomplished. With one hand, the President approves these programs by signing the congressional appropriation for them, and then, with the other hand, he kills the programs.

While I am very much in sympathy with the President's desires to hold the line on spending in order to assist the Nation's economy, I must insist that he has aimed his budget shears at programs

which stimulate real economic growth. There seems to be a great readiness on the part of press and politicians alike to accept and give credence to an over simplistic idea that a dollar reduced in the budget is a dollar impact on inflation. I find such an idea unacceptable. The distortions of an annual budget can demonstrate in two instances the danger of this thinking.

Suppose the Government would expend \$100 in January which would generate \$120 in reserve the following September. Prudence would dictate the investment, but since the bookkeeping would show a total deficit in the fiscal year of expenditure accordingly, the purist would deny the funds. Also, there are more long-range benefits in the infrastructure activities of sewers, education, roads, and so forth without which certain dynamic areas of the economy are blighted. Some areas of expenditure are clearly disassociated from wage-price push and are equally insulated from threatening the capacities of output. What we suggest is that a qualitative rather than a quantitative analysis is required to adjust Federal spending on an intelligent medium and longer basis. Quantitative, short-term analysis will do disservice to our country and its economy.

The construction industry in general and the water and sewer grant program in particular have been pillars of our economic recovery. If the President doubts this, he need only consult his top economic "brain-truster" Treasury Secretary George Shultz. The Secretary, in a speech to the National Homebuilders Conference in Houston, made this point very emphatically. One is forced to wonder about the coordination and communication in an administration which sends its Secretary of the Treasury out extolling the importance of the home-building economy and then sends out its Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to announce that they are freezing their major housing programs.

Both the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee have made public their disappointment as to the nature of the President's decision and the fact that the action was taken without any effort to consult the Congress at any point. I would like to join other Members in assuring the American people that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee are not going to ignore the President's actions. We will be taking a very hard look at the administration's housing policies—or rather lack of policy—and will do what we can to insure the fulfillment of the Nation's housing goals, despite the obstacles created by the administration.

LOS ANGELES/BOMBAY SISTER CITY PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the sister cities program has been doing excellent

work in developing a new level of international understanding. Los Angeles has been in the lead in encouraging this program throughout the world.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor, which pays particular attention to the contributions being made by Los Angeles to the sister cities program. The article was written by Mr. Robert Hardy Andrews of my district, chairman of the Los Angeles/Bombay Sister City Committee.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

SISTER CITIES—FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON A "RELATIVE" LEVEL

(By Robert Hardy Andrews)

LOS ANGELES.—This sprawling megalopolis, sometimes described as seven suburbs looking for a city, is also widely known as claimant to the most of almost everything, from number of new settlers to density of smog. Now a new "We're Number 1!" goes on the list.

Within the past few months Los Angeles has adopted four more sister cities. Added to seven already taken into the family, this makes the City of Los Angeles unchallenged *Numero Uno* in the little publicized, good-neighbor campaign that began when President Eisenhower inaugurated the People-to-People program in 1956.

Since then, a low-key effort by private citizens to break down spite fences and build friendships at the ends of the earth, where official ambassadors are not always notably successful, has partnered 390 United States communities with 449 cities and towns in 60 foreign countries.

California leads all states with 85 sister city affiliations with 117 far-off siblings. Los Angeles alone is partnered with Elath, Israel; Salvador de Bahia, Brazil; Bordeaux, France; Pusan, South Korea; Berlin, Germany; Nagoya, Japan; Bombay, India; Auckland, N.Z.; Tehran, Iran; Lusaka in Zambia; and Mexico City.

Why are Los Angeles and California so far out in front? Californian modesty restricts reply to pointing out that first overtures came from the other end of the two-way road. Mexico has 53 sister cities in California. Japan has 22. Bombay, 10,000 miles away, chose Los Angeles as most-wanted sister ahead of Leningrad, Stuttgart, and Honolulu.

Responding to this, 400 volunteers formed the Los Angeles-Bombay Sister City Committee, and set about raising \$10,000 to help build a City of Los Angeles High School as a friendship landmark in Bombay. The Bombay side will provide land, labor, and materials to complete a high school for 400 pupils. Forty committee members will go to India this month to present the Los Angeles contribution to neighborliness during observance of the Bombay municipality's centenary.

Said a Bombay editorial: "This is not by any means the only way in which Los Angeles can help. Their city planners can tell us much on how to cope with urban congestion, industrial pollution, rapid-transit systems, and all the problems of a growing metropolis."

Politics brought murmurs that Los Angeles Mayor Samuel Yorty, who has been called "the only American mayor with a foreign policy," favors sister city proliferation because he likes to travel. However City Councilman John Ferraro compared Bombay's growth from two million population in 1947 to six million in 1972, and said "We can probably learn as much from Bombay as they can learn from us."

He explained the operating rules of sister city organizations. They draw no public funds, are incorporated as nonprofit and nonpolitical organizations, are independent of City Hall or Washington officialdom, and work on the simple principle that "with nowhere farther from anywhere any more

than 24 hours by air, we're all next-door neighbors, and it's time we got acquainted for our mutual benefit."

A case in point is that of the Pusan Sister City Committee, formed in 1967. Philip Ahn, the veteran Oriental actor in Hollywood films, son of Gen. Chang Ho Ahn, who was called "Korea's George Washington," headed a 40-member Los Angeles delegation, paying its own expenses, that was given a civic reception in Pusan in 1968.

Since then, the Los Angeles-Pusan Committee has raised funds to send needy Korean children to school, collected and sent 5,000 textbooks, furnished musical instruments for Pusan's fledgling symphony orchestra, and brought Korean nurses for training in Los Angeles hospitals. In 1971, 25 percent of South Korea's \$280 million trade with the United States came to Southern California, and largely to Los Angeles.

The Los Angeles-Auckland Committee sent two plane-loads of members, including no public officials, to work out a two-way educational and cultural project. The Los Angeles-Nagoya Committee finances students coming from Japan. The El Elath Committee sends such artists as Zubin Mehta, conductor of the Los Angeles Symphony Orchestra, to give concerts in Israel, with receipts going to Israeli charities.

Charity is not the sister city objective, but in emergencies, the good-neighbor policy applies. The Lusaka Committee finances African students coming to learn how to make artificial limbs, greatly needed in Zambia.

Members of the Bordeaux Committee visited France. In return, 200 visitors, many seeing the U.S. for the first time, were welcomed and entertained in homes in Los Angeles.

Encouragement of foreign travel in the U.S. is a facet of all programs. A 9-mile foot race in Sydney, Australia, was linked with sister San Francisco. Runners competed for a trip from Down Under, and entered the Bay City's traditional Bay-to-Breakers marathon.

Santa Monica brought a fire engine for Mazatlan in Mexico, sends its high school band to Mazatlan for an annual concert, stages an annual *Fiesta de Santa Monica y Mazatlan* to raise funds for further sisterly collaboration and exchanges teachers and students as guests in private homes.

At base, sister city selection rests on mutual interests, similarity in economic or other characteristics, and historical ties. Planners consult veterans who have served abroad, travelers, foreign consulates, resident foreign-language groups, and firms with branches in chosen countries. When decision is reached, an invitation goes, proposing exchange of visitors and offering hospitality to those who come.

France has 23 American sister city affiliations. West Germany has 38, Italy 11, Australia 20, Japan 80, Thailand 1 (with Washington, D.C.). On the American side, California's nearest rivals are Michigan, where 27 communities have adopted 36 sister cities overseas, and Florida, where the ratio is 25 to 29. As for municipalities, number 2 is Phoenix, Ariz., sister-tied to Karlsruhe, Germany; Sassari, Italy; Orange, France; Vasteras, Sweden; and Guadalajara, Mexico.

Some choices pair world-apart neighbors that travel agents would be hard put to pinpoint on the map: Tucson, Ariz., with Trikala, Greece; Miami, Fla., and Me-Ami, Israel; Woodbridge, Conn., with Linguere in Senegal; Independence, Mo., and Blantyre-Limbe, Malawi; Hammonton, N.J., with St. Helier on an English Channel island.

San Clemente, Calif., site of the Western White House, chose San Clemente del Tuyu in Argentina. Small Santa Fe Springs has heartroom for Mersin, Turkey; Navojos, Mexico; Santa Fe, Argentina. Fresno is partnered with Lahore, Pakistan; Kochi, Japan; and Moulmein, Burma, on Kipling's road to Mandalay.

Name-alikes are popular. Lodi, Calif., chose

Lodi, Italy; Cupertino, Calif., picked Italy's Cupertino; Merced, Calif., chose Mercedes in Uruguay.

Artesia, Calif., has the sister with the odd-name: Koudekerk-aan-den-Rijn in the Netherlands.

Whatever inspires selection, the overall record shows that the People-to-People concept is more than rhetoric. In Glendale, Calif., affiliated with Higashiosaka, Japan, special passports are issued, signed by mayors of both cities, given to travelers going or coming as "Your ticket to a friendly home." Monterey Park has put out a decal that blends the California community's Nachi Garden and Nachikatsuura's waterfall in Japan, under the legend *Tomadachi*: "Friend."

The various sister city committees are members of the Town Affiliation Planning Sister Cities Program, headquartered in Washington, D.C., but receive no government or other subsidies. Says Judge Rex Winter, former Santa Monica mayor and City Council member, a leader in the program: "It may not work any miracles, but it's a step in the right direction. There's no 'Ugly American' show-off behavior. In fact, our neighbors overseas seem surprised to find how civilized we are. And it certainly can't hurt for us to learn the same about them."

HEROIN PUSHERS

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is a nationwide problem that has permeated all the facets of our society. It affects children as well as adults; the ghetto dweller and the suburbanite; military and civilian, athlete and entertainer, employer and employee. All ethnic groups are vulnerable; black, white, chicano, and Indian alike.

Every human problem of this type where human frailties are involved seems to attract human jackals who thrive on the weak. In this case the "jackal" is the pusher, seeking profit in the weakness of man.

Drugs differ, and so do pushers. It is essential that we differentiate between one addict given, or even selling, narcotics to another and the nonaddict pusher who in a cold and calculated manner pushes heroin. We must get this individual off this street.

My bill provides that any person who is not himself an addict and knowingly and intentionally distributes or possesses with intent to distribute, heroin to a person 21 years of age or older shall be sentenced to a term of 20 years. Distribution to a person under 21 years of age shall invoke a term of imprisonment of 30 years. Such sentences shall not be suspended. Probation shall not be granted, and in the case of an alien, deportation shall not be allowed in lieu of such sentence.

Mr. Speaker, heroin pushers must be dealt with in a manner commensurate with their crime. I include the text of my bill in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 2426

A bill to provide increased penalties for distribution of heroin by certain persons, and

to provide for pretrial detention of such persons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part D of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DISTRIBUTION OF HEROIN BY PERSONS NOT ADDICTS

"SEC. 412. (a) Any person who is not himself an addict, and who violates section 401 (a) (1) by knowingly or intentionally distributing, or possessing with intent to distribute, heroin to a person twenty-one years of age or older, shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of twenty years. Except, if any person commits such a violation after one or more prior convictions of him for an offense punishable under this subsection, such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of thirty years.

"(b) Any person who is not himself an addict and who violates section 401 (a) (1) by knowingly or intentionally distributing, or possessing with intent to distribute, heroin to a person under twenty-one years of age shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of thirty years. Except, if any person commits such a violation after one or more prior convictions of him for an offense punishable under this subsection, such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of forty-five years.

"(c) In the case of any sentence imposed under this section, imposition or execution of such sentence shall not be suspended, probation shall not be granted, and section 4204 of title 18 of the United States Code and the Act of July 15, 1932 (D.C. Code, secs. 24-203-24-207), shall not apply."

(b) Section 405 of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by striking out "Any person eighteen" each time it appears and inserting "Except as provided in section 412, any person eighteen" in lieu thereof.

(c) Section 401 (b) of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by striking out "section 405" and inserting "sections 405 and 412" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. The table of contents of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 is amended by inserting—"Sec. 412. Distribution of heroin by persons not addicted."

Immediately after

"Sec. 411. Proceedings to establish previous convictions."

SEC. 3. Chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 3146 the following new section:

"§ 3146A. Pretrial detention in certain narcotics cases

"(a) Subject to the provisions of this section, a judicial officer may order pretrial detention of a person charged with unlawful distribution of, or possession with intent to distribute, heroin.

"(b) No person described in subsection (a) of this section shall be ordered detained unless the judicial officer—

"(1) holds a pretrial detention hearing in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c) of this section;

"(2) finds—

"(A) that there is clear and convincing evidence that the person is a person described in subsection (a) of this section;

"(B) that based on the factors described in section 3146 (b) of this title there is no condition or combination of conditions of release which will reasonably assure the safety of any other person or the community;

"(C) that on the basis of information presented by proffer or otherwise to the judicial officer there is a substantial probability that the person committed the offense for which he is present before the judicial officer;

"(D) that such person is not himself an addict as defined in section 4521 (a) of this title; and

"(3) issues an order of detention accompanied by written findings of fact and the reasons for its entry.

"(c) The following procedures shall apply to pretrial detention hearings held pursuant to this section:

"(1) Whenever the person is before a judicial officer, the hearing may be initiated on oral motion of the United States attorney.

"(2) Whenever the person has been released pursuant to section 3146 and it subsequently appears that the person may be subject to pretrial detention, the United States attorney may initiate a pretrial detention hearing by ex parte written motion. Upon such motion the judicial officer may issue a warrant for the arrest of the person and if the person is outside the district, he shall be brought before a judicial officer in the district where he is arrested and shall then be transferred to the district in which his arrest was ordered for proceedings in accordance with this section.

"(3) The pretrial detention hearing shall be held immediately upon the person's being brought before the judicial officer for such hearing unless the person or the United States attorney moves for a continuance. A continuance granted on motion of the person shall not exceed five calendar days, unless there are extenuating circumstances. A continuance on motion of the United States attorney shall be granted upon good cause shown and shall not exceed three calendar days. The person may be detained pending the hearing.

"(4) The person shall be entitled to representation by counsel and shall be entitled to present information by proffer or otherwise, to testify, and to present witnesses in his own behalf.

"(5) Information stated in, or offered in connection with, any order entered pursuant to this section need not conform to the rules pertaining to the admissibility of evidence in a court of law.

"(6) Testimony of the person given during the hearing shall not be admissible on the issue of guilt in any other judicial proceeding, but such testimony shall be admissible in proceedings under section 3150, in perjury proceedings, and for the purpose of impeachment in any subsequent proceedings.

"(7) An appeal from an order granting or denying detention may be taken pursuant to section 3147.

"(d) The following shall be applicable to persons detained pursuant to this section:

"(1) The person shall be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel and, for good cause shown, shall be released upon order of the judicial officer in the custody of the United States marshal or other appropriate person for limited periods of time to prepare defenses or for other proper reasons.

"(2) The case of the person shall be placed on an expedited calendar and, consistent with the sound administration of justice, his trial shall be given priority.

"(3) The person shall be treated in accordance with section 3146—

"(A) upon the expiration of sixty calendar days, unless the trial is in progress or the trial has been delayed at the request of the person other than by the filing of timely motions except motions for continuances; or

"(B) whenever a judicial officer finds that a subsequent event has eliminated the basis for detention.

"(4) The person shall be deemed detained pursuant to section 3146 if he is convicted.

"(e) The judicial officer may detain for a period not to exceed five calendar days a person charged with an offense who comes before him for a bail determination if it appears that a person is on probation, parole,

or mandatory release pending completion of sentence for any offense under State or Federal law and that the person may flee or pose a danger to any other person or the community if released. During the five-day period, the United States attorney shall notify the appropriate State or Federal probation or parole officials. If such officials fail or decline to take the person into custody during such period, the person shall be treated in accordance with section 3146, unless he is subject to detention under this chapter. If the person is subsequently convicted of the offense charged, he shall receive credit toward services of sentence for the time he was detained pursuant to this subsection.

SEC. 4. The chapter analysis of chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting

"3146A. Pretrial detention in certain narcotics cases."

immediately after

"3146. Release in noncapital cases prior to trial."

FOOD LABELING COMBATS NUTRITIONAL ILLITERACY

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced the Nutritional Labeling Act to provide for the establishment of national standards for nutritional labeling of food commodities. I introduced this measure because I have become increasingly aware of the fact that, as incredible as it seems, there is a growing nutritional famine in the United States. In fact, experts have declared we are a nation of "nutritional illiterates," filling our stomachs with food of little or no nutritional value. Surveys by the Department of Agriculture show that diets of all our citizens—regardless of income—have steadily deteriorated over the years in terms of nutrient value.

Hence I was pleased by the recently announced Food and Drug Administration's food labeling regulations, for they are very similar to the provisions contained in my bill, although the FDA program is voluntary rather than mandatory. The FDA has ruled that it lacks the legal authority to require nutritional labeling by food companies. But Commissioner Edwards has stated that he expects 75 to 90 percent of food products will ultimately be affected due to competitive pressures. In fact, a survey conducted by the Consumer Research Institute concluded that products containing nutritional labeling sell better, a fact which attests to high consumer interest in this area.

December 31, 1974, is the date when all products that come under the regulations must be properly labeled to be shipped and displayed in retail stores. I think we can give the food companies the benefit of this time interval to see just how far they voluntarily participate in the labeling program. Should the results fail to be favorable, then I believe Congress should establish a clear legislative mandate requiring nutritional labeling and other information programs.

For the consumer, the regulations will provide more detailed information on foods sold in the markets. Full nutrition labeling is mandatory on any product for which a nutritional claim is made in the labeling or advertising, such as "low calorie" or "rich in vitamin C." This requirement would force companies to establish their food claim convincingly. The full nutritional labeling must follow FDA's exact form: Serving size; servings per container; calorie, protein, carbohydrate and fat content expressed in grams. In addition, the percentage of the U.S. Recommended Daily Allowance—RDA—for protein and seven vitamins and minerals must be included.

I was especially pleased to note that the recommended daily allowance replaces the minimum daily requirements as the FDA's standard for adequate nutrition intake. In general, the new standards—just revised by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, are nearly double the old minimum daily requirements which were set by the Government more than 20 years ago to conform with assumed nutritional needs for basic subsistence. The recommended daily allowances are based upon medical studies of the nutritional requirements of people of many ages and both sexes for maintenance of good health.

To mention just a few other points included in the FDA's regulations—information regarding cholesterol, fat, and fatty acids are to be listed when claims concerning fat content are made for the product. This regulation is to help the consumer identify foods for use in fat-modified diets. Also, dietary food supplements must be labeled with the percentage of the RDA for the vitamins and minerals they contain.

I believe these regulations are basic and far reaching, a furtherance of our efforts to help consumers select food of real value. Within the next 6 months we can expect FDA regulations covering guidelines on percentage labeling, on when a manufacturer can and cannot make a low-calorie claim for a product, and the recommended amount of nutrients in food categories such as main dishes, cereals, and liquid diet. I would hope the FDA will also move to establish regulations for a uniform system of grading food, identification of the manufacturer, unit pricing, and perishability information.

Finally, consumer education on nutrition is an important byproduct of nutritional labeling programs. Having these regulations and the information on our food packages will be meaningless if the consumer does not know what they mean. We must exert every effort to educate the public as to their nutritional needs and how to read the nutritional labeling. I look to the FDA, industry, and professional and consumer groups to play an important role in this respect. I also believe our schools can be a vital component in this education program, teaching our students early in life their nutritional needs. Once again I believe we can become a nation of healthy citizens.

ROBERT H. "BOB" CLARK

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has lost one of its outstanding working newsmen. I have lost a longtime friend. Robert H. "Bob" Clark, who was known as the dean of State House press corps in Topeka, died recently of cancer.

Bob and I were in the same class at the University of Wichita. He covered the State House for the Kansas City Star-Times when I served in the Kansas Legislature. He continued to do his job even though he knew the extent of his illness.

Bob Clark will be missed in Kansas, not only by his colleagues in the press corps, but those of us who knew and respected him for his fairness, accuracy, and objectivity in covering his news beat.

Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his beloved family on their great loss.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from Kansas newspapers which convey the high esteem that Bob Clark earned. The editorials follow:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Jan. 2, 1973]

ROBERT H. "BOB" CLARK

Missing from the columns of the Kansas City Star and Times will be the familiar byline of Robert H. Clark, Topeka correspondent.

A native Kansan, Bob was born in Hutchinson, educated at Wichita University and served two years as a reporter for the Wichita Eagle before moving to the Star and Times.

A veteran of World War II, Bob served in a writers' unit at the Pensacola (Fla.) Naval Air Station and was sent to Topeka in 1946 to succeed the Star's veteran Topeka correspondent, Cecil Howes.

In point of service, he was dean of the Statehouse press corps, and had a host of friends among the representatives and senators who served in legislative sessions he had covered during his 26 years' on the Kansas political scene.

Bob's health began failing with a serious liver disorder about 14 years ago which nearly cost him his life. It was throat cancer which finally wrote "thirty" to Bob's newspaper career.

He was a devoted newsman who loved his work. Even when he knew cancer had attacked his larynx and that he was faced with serious surgery, he somehow could not stay away from the job he loved.

His appearance at the Statehouse on his regular beat, somehow left the impression he wanted to be on the scene to the last, and that he did not wish to engender too much concern among his fellow newsmen.

It was Bob's way of life.

[From the Kansas City Star]

BOB CLARK'S TOPEKA SCENE

On every newspaper there are those few staff members permanently stationed at more or less distant bureau offices who are better known—and sometimes better appreciated—by the news sources they deal with daily than most of their colleagues in the home office. Robert H. Clark, who died Wednesday at 60, had been The Star's Topeka correspondent since 1946.

On his visits to The Star city room, most often for an election night ballot-counting vigil, Bob Clark was warmly welcomed by

those few editors and other writers who regularly dealt with him. But by the nature of things his competence and capabilities were more widely known to hundreds of Kansans—governors, legislators, state office-holders and their employees and just ordinary Sunflower State folk.

In covering 17 sessions of the Kansas Legislature, Mr. Clark developed a knack for plowing through the statutory verbiage to get to the heart of the matter and explain, in his stories, what a proposed bill would do and how it would affect Kansans. His concise stories reflected an appreciation of the space demands on a metropolitan newspaper trying to cover the news at every level from local to international—and they were accordingly appreciated by his editors.

Mr. Clark, born in Hutchinson, graduated from the University of Wichita and with brief newspaper experience there before joining The Star in 1936, had a native feel for Kansans and their interests. An old-fashioned reporter with copypaper notepad in hand and no pretensions of expertise, he enjoyed a natural empathy with state officials from the Flint Hills and wheat counties as well as the bright young men from the state's burgeoning urban areas.

After hours, his Star friends knew him as an affable companion with whom to relax in newsmen's shoptalk, unlimbering the personal opinions the objective reporter must forgo in his copy. Bob Clark, with his fine grasp of the tone of the Topeka statehouse, was an able and valued worker for this newspaper for more than 36 years.

[From the Hutchinson, Kans., News]

BOB CLARK

The dean of the Kansas Statehouse press corps, Robert H. (Bob) Clark, is dead of cancer.

Born in Hutchinson, he began covering the happenings at Topeka for the Kansas City Star and Times in 1946. In his 26 years of writing, Bob covered those happenings as fairly and accurately as he could, and he loved every minute of it.

Gov. Robert Docking called him a good newsmen.

In the news business, he was known as a good man.

Both descriptions fit.

STRAIGHT TALK FROM JESSE CALHOON ON THE DECLINE OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

MR. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, there have been many reasons advanced for the decline of the American-flag merchant marine. We have all heard or read them: costly strikes, high labor costs, unfair foreign competition, and the like. It is an all-too-familiar litany which perhaps does not tell the full story.

Now, a new perspective has been presented by the plain-talking and articulate president of the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association—AFL-CIO—Jesse M. Calhoun. In the December issue of the American Marine Engineer, Mr. Calhoun has spelled out what he calls "the real gut problems that have caused the decline of the American merchant marine." In his column, On the Line, he

documents the many management and governmental errors and blunders that have helped create the situation American shipping is in today.

All of us in Congress who are concerned with the American merchant marine—and that includes most Members of both bodies—should carefully read Mr. Calhoun's presentation. It is a challenging document that poses many questions that deserve thoughtful answers. I therefore include Mr. Calhoun's column to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

MANAGEMENT AND POLITICAL ERRORS ARE BIGGEST FACTORS IN DECLINE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT FLEET

(By J. M. Calhoun)

Much has been said and written over the years on the causes which have brought about the decline of the American-flag merchant marine. The pros and cons have been expounded *ad infinitum* by the wise 'experts' of maritime management. They have been debated in countless forums throughout the maritime world, and the blame for the U.S. merchant fleet's deterioration almost always seems to end up at the door of maritime labor.

Now I would like to discuss in this column MEBA's version of how the merchant marine got into its present sad state. To tell you what you do not read in the newspapers, what you do not read in magazines, what the Government bureaucrats do not go around the country making speeches about. I would like to talk about the real gut problems that have caused the decline of the American Merchant Marine.

Let me say why the employers go around the country making speeches that everything wrong with the American Merchant Marine is caused by the maritime unions. The reason they make those speeches is because they are gutless, because they will not tell the American people, they will not even tell their own employees, what their basic problems are, because they are afraid the screws will be turned up by some Government bureaucrat.

They can be strangled but you will never hear an American ship owner say one word about the bureaucracy in Washington that is strangling them.

Let us talk about some of the silly mistakes that management has made. Let us look at the Grace Line. Grace Line built four beautiful ships of the Santa Magdalena class.

What kind of ships were they? They were ships that had to have four cargoes to make a living with no interchange of cargoes. They had to carry 120 passengers; they had to carry containers; they had to carry break bulk and they had to carry reefer cargo.

If there was a breakdown in any one of those cargoes they were losing money. If there was a surplus of another cargo they could not put the passengers in the container space, and they could not put the reefer cargo in the break bulk space.

They spent the assets of that company on these four ships that were white elephants. Has the Government accused them of blowing million of dollars, ships that would run so long as there were four specific cargoes from specific ports?

Has there been any criticism of the Grace Line over that mismanaged operation?

No. But let a union tie up one ship for one day and you read it in the headlines of all the newspapers. The steamship lines can waste the biggest amounts of money and you never hear one word of criticism.

Let us take the largest American steamship company, the United States Lines, in my opinion one of the greatest American steamship companies, and let us see what happened there.

Number one, they go over on the west side of Manhattan and they build a beautiful pier, and I think they spent thirty or forty million dollars on building it. They are now spending several millions of dollars a year for rent on this pier, and it has cobwebs growing from one end to the other.

They decided to build a large ship; fine. But isn't it something to be noted in this country that when you build a brand-new modern ship that costs millions and millions of dollars and which comes down the ways and is put alongside the dock and then she is cut in half because they built the wrong ship?

Now let us take the next big mistake they made. They built a class of ships called the racer. These ships were built specifically for Australian trade. They had 600,000 cubic feet of reefer to be used in the Australian trade.

Now the United States Lines decided to sell the Australian trade but nobody thought about selling the Australian ships. Where are you going to use 600,000 cubic feet reefer ships except in the Australian trade? Did you read that in the newspapers? Did you hear any Government official criticize that?

Those three mistakes took at least \$100 million out of the operating capital of the United States Lines and left them with their pockets empty.

Now with the decline of the United States Lines from 55 ships to 30 ships, was it caused by labor or was it management incompetence?

How many new ships do you see coming down the ways making two or three sailing trips a year and going in to be reconverted into container ships?

There was one company on the West Coast that built six ships. They got them running and within six months five of them were tied up in the Far East lacking a propeller. Was that the American labor unions or was that the stupidity of somebody else?

The engineers on the Lash ship tell me that the ships are built so tender if they are not careful they burn out the reduction gear.

Was that labor's fault or was that the in-competence of management?

How about construction delays in the building of new type ships in U.S. yards? What sort of bureaucratic ineptitude and poor yard planning is it that cause delays of up to two years in vessel consignment. How can foreign-flag operators get hold of a new American design, contract for construction at the same time a U.S. company does, and get the ships into the water two years before the American-flag lines get their vessels?

Can they blame that on maritime labor? That has happened in several cases, and the most glaring one being the last. The Central Gulf foreign flag ship was out two years before the Prudential Lines even though the Prudential Lines contract was let first. Can you blame that on American seamen? I do not think so.

Let us look at the stupidity on the political end. We have had a Congressman in Brooklyn, who as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for many, many years had gotten through the Appropriations Committee every single request that has been made of him.

He was in a tough election and to me the political philosophy did not matter at all—this man had delivered.

In that primary in Brooklyn, I saw seamen, ship officers; I saw longshoremen, I saw teamsters, I saw the building trades, but I did not see one shipowner who had been the profiteer of all this money appropriated by John Rooney—not one single one of them was out working for him.

I will now leave the shipowners and go to the other albatross we have on our back and

that is the Government bureaucrats. In 1968, President Nixon made a speech in Seattle, Washington outlining the maritime program.

Prior to this, NMU President Curran had served on a commission set up by President Johnson. They worked diligently for years and they came up with a very, very comprehensive constructive report that was immediately filed in the back room and nobody has seen it since.

But at least Nixon took some portion of this report and made a speech that he was going to put in a maritime program. Up to this day he has lived up to every thing he has promised the maritime industry.

Granted, he did not promise all we asked for, but what he has promised, he has lived up to.

But look what we have had under Mr. Nixon. When the President submitted his bill to Congress with the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, we had the Congress with us.

Dumbo, the elephant, could not have kept that bill from passing. Dumbo could not have kept that bill from being signed into law. But there are bureaucrats running around in this country day by day, taking all the credit of passing that bill.

That bill was passed because the American trade union movement had worked over the years to elect a Congress that was favorable to labor and particularly favorable to the American Merchant Marine and the President of the United States had committed himself to this bill and he delivered his end of it and the Congress delivered their end.

But while the debate on this bill was going on, the bureaucrats were under their blankets and they talked away. First off they wanted an American subsidy to subsidize owners who had both American and foreign flagships.

We got to the Congress and we had it reduced to ten years, and then we had one of those midnight switches and it went up to twenty years but at least it did have a terminal date and a date they had to file.

The same bureaucrats were trying to get legislation introduced for unlimited ownership of foreign flagships while dragging their heels on subsidies for American flagships.

If that happens to the American flagship industry, they will use the foreign flagship to kill off the American competitors and then they will put all their ships under the foreign flags.

We cannot live with that type of operation. We have seen it in the North Atlantic in the last two years and it has been devastating.

The maritime administrator in the Fall of 1970, went out and made a speech that LNG ships were too expensive for this country and we should not pay any attention to them; that foreign shipyards should build the LNG ships; that when you are talking about \$68 million, that is too much money for the ship. That was the thinking of the maritime administrator, Andrew Gibson, in the Fall of 1970 and at that time the price of the LNG ship was \$68 million.

On September 29, they signed contracts for LNG ships in excess of \$90 million. That is an additional \$22 million of a debt those ships must carry because we missed the opportunity when the iron was hot and we missed it because a bureaucrat did not understand this industry.

We have in our maritime administration a resources development program appropriation of twenty five to thirty million dollars a year.

I can tell you that I do not know of one single beneficial effort that has come out of that twenty five or thirty million dollars a year to the American Merchant Marine. It is a research wasteland.

There was no real effort to build in 1970, because proper research had not been carried out by the Maritime Administration which later came up with a regulation stipu-

lating that to qualify for construction or operating subsidy, the ship must be engaged in American commerce fifty percent of the time.

One shipowner came to me and he had two contracts. He had a contract to haul coal from Virginia to Genoa, Italy, and bring oil from Liberia to Canada. Because coal is lighter and oil is heavier, he also had a higher revenue producing income from the oil than the coal.

Even though the ship was going to the United States and every single trip with a full load of cargo, it was not fifty percent of his commerce and he could not qualify for a subsidy.

That is the kind of bureaucracy we have had under a President who has tried to make the American Merchant Marine viable.

Then the Administration came to us and said, "We think we can build up our Russian trade; if the maritime unions will cooperate we assure you that you will participate and there will be a bilateral agreement with Russia."

In November 1971 the maritime unions met in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, and we made an agreement with the Administration as to the shipping of grain to Russia, and we said we would not object if during this time they would negotiate a bilateral agreement that American ships should participate fully in this trade, and that the shipments of grain would move without obstruction by the maritime unions. Then in June of 1972 we met in New York.

I will give here some clauses from this agreement:

It is the intention of the bilateral shipping agreement between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. that each will carry equal shares of the trade between the two nations.

It is the intent of both the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America that they carry a substantial part of the trade between the two nations—substantial. That is intended to mean at least one third by the U.S.S.R. and one third by the U.S.A.

The United States Government will provide the necessary subsidies to the United States ship owners to effectuate this agreement.

This was signed by Andrew E. Gibson for the Administration.

On Monday, September 18, I got reports from ship owners that they had had a briefing from the State Department saying that the American ships would only carry part of this grain if the Russian ships carried part of the grain; that the grain already booked would not be included in the American share.

I picked up the telephone and I called Gibson, who was then the Assistant Commerce Secretary for International Affairs. He said it was not true, that there was not one word of fact to it. "The agreement we made with you we made in good faith and we are going to live up to it."

On Wednesday, September 20, all the maritime unions and the employers were at a national maritime council meeting in Washington where the maritime administrator explained the Russian agreement.

He explained it exactly as I picked it up from the ship owners and exactly as I heard it from the members of the press.

Maritime unions understandably were angry and we let them know that that dog was not going to hunt; if that was going to be the name of the game there was going to be no cargo moved to Russia.

Fortunately, on the following Friday I saw the President of the United States down in Texas and I explained the problem to him.

The President was not aware of the problem. He made an appointment with me at the Waldorf-Astoria on Tuesday, Septem-

ber 26, and he said in plain and simple English: "I know the agreement that was made with the maritime unions and I fully intend to live up to that agreement. You are going to get your full one-third share and it is going to be mandatory, and it is going to be in the bilateral shipping agreement between the U.S.A. and Russia."

Mr. Gibson had told me less than the truth. He was going to let the American Merchant Marine depend on the largesse of the Soviet Union. There was no guarantee in this agreement by the American Government mentioning one third share.

The only thing mentioning one third was a letter from the Soviet Union to Andrew Gibson saying "We, the Soviets, intend to use one third American ships"—no commitment from the State Department, no commitment from the Commerce Department. They thought they could sell us a pig in the poke and we would buy it.

Fortunately, all the maritime unions were awake and they didn't get away with it.

Now, I would like to talk about the Pay Board because you read so much about it, and the maritime unions. Let me tell you that in getting prepared for the Pay Board this year, we engaged Stanley Ruttenberg, who is an economist and a researcher.

He did a productivity study, and not just for the Merchant Marine, but for other industries as well, and I would just like to read some of the figures:

Now, from 1962 to 1972, the per man productivity in the maritime industry is up nearly 700 percent, and this is productivity by man. If you take the productivity by ship, it is only increased about 450 percent, so per man, it is up 700 percent in ten years.

Now, the airline industry has always been the darling of the economists when it comes to productivity. If we include the passenger ships in the productivity study, well, the increased productivity in the maritime industry exceeds the productivity of the airlines in the last ten years.

It is now running on an average of an increase in productivity of 15.7 percent per year.

It is funny, we haven't heard any ship-owners or any Government officials or any of the other people that have been criticizing the American seamen or their unions saying that we have the most highly productive and best seamen in the world.

Now, there is a need as defined by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, and the American Maritime Institute, for 120 gas ships in the next twelve years, and they can be built cheaper, operated cheaper in the United States than anywhere else in the world because they don't have the expensive interest rates, for the interest rates are cheaper here than anywhere else in the world. So when you talk about \$90 million ships that can be financed at four percent interest in the United States, and when you know that eight percent is charged in Japan, and your four percent interest is \$3.6 million per ship, per year, you understand.

The crew cost of a ship is only about a million dollars, so if they are built here, they start out with a two million six hundred thousand dollar edge above the foreign built ships, so the construction subsidy makes them hold even the foreign construction prices.

Lastly, I would like to come to a problem of the runaway-flagship, and that is a problem in cargo.

The industry has been changing so rapidly, we must not think in a stereotyped old way of the great bulk ship and the liner.

The industry is changing into massive bulk carriers, both dry cargo and oil.

By all these studies, we find that in the next twelve years we need 120 gas ships and

we need 400-250,000 ton tankers. That is the area we must get into.

Now, we fought a good fight in Washington last year and we came within four votes of winning the 50-50 Oil Bill. To pass this bill for the industry. But I did not see many ship owners there.

They have a great association to which they pay their dues, but they took a position of no position. Mr. Reynolds of AIMS would not testify. That was the interest the American ship owners had in building the American Merchant Marine.

They didn't have enough interest to have their association testify on behalf of the bill. But we came within four votes of getting it, and believe me, we are going to get it next year.

There are a lot of Congressmen, there are a lot of Senators that were on the fence, and our little union talked to them, I know the National Maritime Union, and all the other maritime unions were doing the same thing, for the legislators are not going to get labor support unless they vote right on that 50-50 Maritime Bill.

I am very happy that the National AFL-CIO gave us that little extra lift that we need. They took the 50-50 bill and made it one of the ten political bills of the United States Senate, a feat on which they grade Senators by.

The aerospace industry couldn't get the SST in as one of those critical bills, they couldn't get the Lockheed loan, but the maritime unions were able to get the 50-50 Oil Bill as one of those bills simply because of the effective leadership in the maritime unions.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT ON THE YEAR 2000

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my January 1, 1973, Washington report entitled "The Year 2000."

THE YEAR 2000

At a time when most of us are wishing our friends a Happy New Year and thinking of resolutions for 1973, a few observations about the more distant future—the year 2000, to be exact—may be in order.

Strangely enough, the future in the year 2000 is reasonably foreseeable on the basis of information now available and barring a cataclysmic event, such as a nuclear war.

A lot more people will be living in the world, and in the United States, at the turn of the century. The world's population will be almost doubled from the present 3.5 billion people; the United States may have 300 million residents, as compared to today's 200 million, most of them living in the cities.

Our gross national product (the total goods and services produced) will be at least twice its present size, surrounding Americans with twice as many things as they have today. People will be making more money, too. The average family income, in today's dollars, will be about \$20,000 per year.

Technology will bring spectacular developments. Artificial organs will be commonly available. Man will occupy the sea for farming, recreation and military purposes. Climate control will be possible. Parents will have the ability to choose the sex of their child, and genetic control will allow man to control his own evolution. The amount of knowledge available will be staggering. When

a child born today graduates from college, the amount of knowledge in the world will be four times as great, and by the time he is 50, it will be 32 times as great.

Even with explosive growth all around, some things will not be growing. We live in a finite world. We will have to share our irreplaceable natural resources with a lot more people, who will be consuming a lot more things. Sooner or later, for example, we will have to deal with water as a scarce resource, and we will find that the austerity required of us in using water comes hard because we have used it abundantly and freely.

Whether we like it or not, we cannot avoid dealing with the changes, the growth and the technological advances. If we have a water shortage, to continue the example, we can charge more for it, transfer people to another part of the country where water is more plentiful, or construct bigger reservoirs. But one thing is certain—growth will force change upon us, and confront us with all kinds of hard questions:

Can we establish effective and democratic governmental system with this kind of growth?

Will our food production be sufficient to feed all the new people?

Will the depletion of our resources, like oil and gas, end, or sharply curtail, industrial production?

Will our economic system continue to distribute and allocate our resources and goods in an acceptable way?

We must begin to think carefully about what kind of a future we want for ourselves—in Indiana and in the nation. Already some states are beginning to have conferences on what they want their state to be like in the 21st Century, and that kind of advanced planning strikes me favorably.

We cannot let the future happen to us by default. Better by far to look ahead now, see what kind of opportunities and challenges confront us, assess our strengths and weaknesses, ask ourselves what things we cherish most, weigh the costs and the benefits, and begin now to control our future, rather than let it control us.

The sooner we begin to think about these things, the less difficult, perhaps the less impossible, our tasks will be.

The year 2,000 can be the dawn of a golden age. I believe this nation has the resources and the intelligence to meet the challenges of change. Thomas Jefferson said: "I like the dreams of the future better than the history of the past." As we wish our friends and neighbors a happy and prosperous 1973, it is time to dream of an even more distant future—the 21st Century.

ROBERTO CLEMENTE

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Roberto Clemente stunned not only the sports world, but all who saw in this truly great athlete the dedication and compassion of an equally great humanitarian.

The finest tribute I believe that I have read came from a young eighth grader who said:

I am not a baseball fan, but I know who he was, he was a great Puerto Rican.

Roberto Clemente will surely be enshrined in the baseball Hall of Fame

and the statistics of his outstanding baseball career will be long remembered by the fans, but more importantly, Roberto Clemente will be remembered for the same reasons he was revered in his native Puerto Rico, because he was concerned about people, because he was never too busy or too self-important to be involved, because he was a man who sought to help others.

Roberto Clemente died as he had lived, helping others. Roberto Clemente was in the words of the poet John Donne "involved in mankind" and all of us are diminished by the death of so truly a great human being.

THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION ON EUROPEAN SECURITY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues, ably led by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) expressed their approval of the ideas contained in the recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation.

With important diplomatic conferences about the future of European security and cooperation in their preliminary phase, I consider it important for us in Congress and for the executive departments to consider and analyze the ideas submitted by major national organizations of our citizens who have, either personally, or through their parental heritage, an East-Central European background. Not only do they comprise the most interested parties in our Nation about our European foreign policy, but they include many fine scholars of political science, history, and economics with considerable area expertise; jurists, internationally known church leaders, all of whom are motivated by the desire to help our national interests while also promoting the cause of self-determination for the nations of their cultural heritage.

As cold war tensions decrease in Europe, attention is rightly focused on building a system of lasting peace and order on that continent. Confrontation tactics, upon which the massive presence of Red army units in East-Central Europe is based, work against the interests of peace and security in that part of the world. Yet, if meaningful negotiations are to be undertaken and if diplomacy be successful in overcoming the present impasse, Soviet security interests must also be considered.

Therefore, it is of particular significance to read the resolution of the American Hungarian Federation's neutralization proposal, which, after further study and elaboration might give us a fine diplomatic asset to be used in promoting peace and security, but also the free political development of the nations of

East-Central Europe which despite détente have not yet achieved that goal.

For those reasons, I recommend an in-depth study of the proposals of the American Hungarian Federation by our executive departments and suitable action on them whenever and wherever appropriate opportunities present themselves for progressing toward the goal of a free and neutral East-Central Europe.

**MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
BAND TO PARTICIPATE IN INAUGURAL PARADE**

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the events surrounding the inauguration of a President are significant for all Americans. Through these events, we in a sense pay tribute to the continuity of our great Republic and to our heritage as a free nation. For those who actively participate in the celebration, we are inclined to give special recognition.

I am extremely pleased that the Commonwealth of Kentucky will be represented in this year's inaugural parade by the marching band of Morehead State University, often known as "The Big Blue Band From Daniel Boone Land." Kentuckians are quite proud of this splendid organization from Morehead, which is located in the beautiful Daniel Boone National Forest of eastern Kentucky.

Two hundred and forty-three bandmen will perform a short medley for the Presidential reviewing stand. This will include "My Old Kentucky Home," "Daniel Boone Was a Man," "America the Beautiful," and "2001 Space Odyssey." Featuring a line of 25 beautiful redheads wearing white coonskin caps and accessories, the band—wearing blue uniforms—will display the red, white, and blue national colors to signify the intense patriotism felt by all Kentuckians.

I wish to commend Dr. Adron Doran, president of Morehead State University, and Dr. Robert Hawkins, director of the band, for their fine work toward making the band's participation in this great event a reality.

I include for the RECORD a brief description of Morehead State University, which now has an enrollment of over 6,000 students:

MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

Morehead State University is organized and operated to accomplish the functions of higher education—teaching, research, and service. Six schools plus quality programs in graduate education mark MSU as the foremost institution of higher learning in a broad geographical region. Conveniently located near the edge of Kentucky Appalachia, MSU draws its student body from that area, as well as from the rich agricultural regions of Kentucky and nearby states, and from industrial centers in the Blue Grass and other states. Visitors reach MSU easily on Inter-

state 64 between the Kentucky cities of Lexington and Ashland.

Nearly two decades of continuous, dynamic leadership by President Adron Doran have transformed this half-century-old institution dedicated to training teachers into a broad-spectrum, multi-purpose regional university of superior merit.

Morehead State University offers four-year curricula leading to the A.B., B.S., M.A., and M.S. degrees. The University awards Associate degrees to those individuals who complete one of the prescribed two-year terminal programs. Certificates may be earned for the successful completion of specified one-year programs.

MSU has more than 375 faculty members selected on the basis of their ability to provide students with the finest in instruction. The faculty is highly-trained, cooperative, friendly, and understanding. Excellent dormitory facilities—84 per cent constructed since 1960—make it possible for students to live in a wholesome atmosphere under good working conditions. Sharing the campus with the living area are the academic facilities, subject of constant modernization and expansion during the past decade and a half.

Morehead State University offers its students a broad and varied program of activities which are related to but not necessarily a part of the academic program. Students are encouraged to spend a part of their time at MSU in intramural sports, in clubs and organizations, and in various other types of campus life.

**CLOSED-CIRCUIT TV BILL
REINTRODUCED**

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing in the House today a bill that would prohibit broadcast of major sports events on closed-circuit TV.

Unless Congress acts to place a curb on sports on closed-circuit TV, the huge profits involved in closed-circuit production will be too much of a temptation for big-time sports promoters and many events will be presented on closed-circuit TV.

For example the Super Bowl, which was played last Sunday grossed slightly more than \$4 million. Seventy-five million Americans viewed the Super Bowl. If 20,000,000 Americans were willing to pay \$7.50 to view the Super Bowl, then the gross receipts from one football game would total \$150 million. Assuming only a profit of one-third, big-time sports promoters would have netted a \$50 million profit from one football game.

The comparison of a gross \$4.1 million and a \$50 million profit is simply too much of a temptation for big-time sports promoters.

I believe that a form of creeping closed-circuit sports TV will develop. Gradually, one event after another will be placed on closed-circuit TV and eventually big-time sports promoters will try to force the Super Bowl itself on closed-circuit TV.

Only the Congress can remove this temptation for the big-time sports promoters by enacting legislation that will prohibit closed-circuit TV sports.

If closed-circuit TV becomes the rule rather than the exception an avid fan may wind up paying hundreds of dollars every year just to view his favorite football, baseball, basketball, or boxing match on closed-circuit TV.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold further public hearings on bills to establish a privilege in newsmen to refuse to disclose information or the source of information received by them in the course of newsgathering. The projected public hearings will commence on Thursday, February 1, 1973, at 10 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

At this time 13 measures, sponsored or cosponsored by 26 Members of the House, have been introduced, and more are expected. Four measures have been introduced in the other body, with three more predicted. Additional House bills introduced and available prior to the hearings will also be considered by the subcommittee.

This legislation involves the further examination by the Congress of the wisdom of a privilege for newsmen. The issue is will Congress preserve the public's right to be informed by protecting newsmen from compulsory disclosure of confidential sources and confidential information. Obviously, if newsmen can be required to disclose information and the source of information received by them in confidence, their sources will dry up. The public will be the losers. On the other hand, it is essential to preserve the Government's power to elicit information. The hearings will concern the question whether or not a privilege should be created. If so, it must be determined whether the privilege should be absolute or qualified and whether a privilege created by a Federal statute should be made applicable to State as well as Federal proceedings. Problems of definition also present themselves.

In September and October of the last Congress the subcommittee devoted 5 hearing days to this subject, receiving testimony from the authors and cosponsors of legislative measures and from representatives of the Department of Justice and of a number of media groups and organizations. All witnesses other than the representative of the Department of Justice favored some form of privilege. The subcommittee hopes promptly to complete its further hearings and to present its conclusions for consideration of the full committee.

The first day of the further hearings will be devoted to the testimony of Members of Congress. I am happy to announce that the lead-off witness in these

hearings will be the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey, a strong proponent of a newsmen's privilege. Chairman Rodino will be followed by other Members, several of whom have introduced legislation.

Members and others desiring to testify at the hearings should get in touch with Herbert Fuchs, committee counsel, on extension 53926.

WAR POWERS AND THE 93D CONGRESS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the war powers of Congress and the President was a subject of important debate and legislative action in the 92d Congress. The House twice passed a war powers measure, which ultimately died with the end of that Congress when a compromise could not be reached with the other body.

The respective positions taken on the war powers issue by the House and Senate has been a subject of attention in a number of forums. One of those exchanges took place last fall in the pages of *Foreign Policy*, a prestigious journal of opinion. Participating with an article was our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DANTE FASCELL, who has been a prime mover for war powers legislation during the past 3 years.

In his article, Congressman FASCELL cogently defended the House position on war powers against the more drastic measure which was offered in the other body. His position has now drawn support from a leading academic specialist on the war powers question, Dr. Jack M. Schick of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. Dr. Schick's letter appears in the current—winter—edition of *Foreign Policy*. Although the limitations of space do not permit the insertion of the entire symposium in which Mr. FASCELL participated, I believe that our colleagues will find it of interest to read his comments and those of Dr. Schick.

I also wish to insert in the *Record* at this point the text of the war powers legislation—House Joint Resolution 2—which I have introduced into the 93d Congress with the cosponsorship of Mr. FASCELL and other members who have been active on the war powers issue. It is a strengthened and improved version of the war powers resolution which twice passed the House last Congress by overwhelming majorities, and I urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

WHOSE POWER IS WAR POWER?

(By DANTE FASCELL)

One aspect of Senator Eagleton's proposal concerns me. The possibility that it institutionalizes the trend of strong Presidential action and the Congress' rubberstamping it.

Because of the pressure of the 30-day limitation, after taking an authorized and de-

fined emergency action, the President, undoubtedly, will promptly seek congressional approval. Even special rules are provided for the Congress to expedite consideration and action.

The sheer impetus and power of the Presidential commitment in a national emergency is well known; mix in the weight of the Presidential request to the Congress for the expedited consideration; sprinkle liberally with the equally well known attitude of the President's party and the Congress to "rally 'round the flag." Result—a predictable legislative approval of the Presidential action achieved in an almost automatic cycle.

The argument is made that it is better for the Congress to act than not to act even though the price predictably might be pro forma action. I'm not at all certain that's a good bargain. In the nuclear age will there be a formal declaration of war by the U.S. Congress before the fact? Is there a greater chance that most hostility involving the United States will be entered into through one of the authorized and defined emergency portals with congressional action after the fact? It seems to me that the pro forma potential apparently has a much larger dimension. So while the procedural objective is laudable, its pragmatic result may be undesirable.

What we really need and must continue to strive for is simultaneous assurance for the mechanisms and procedures which make a fully informed Congress get into the act before the President takes any action which does or might involve the United States in hostilities regardless of their nature.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

TO THE EDITORS:

I was delighted to see the brief symposium by Senators Eagleton, Stennis, and Goldwater, and Congressman FASCELL on the "War Powers Act" (*Foreign Policy* 8, Fall 1972). The debate on the Senate floor last spring did not receive the attention it deserved because the bill did not become the subject of a great debate between the President and the Congress. Nothing focuses a great debate in the country better than a pitched battle like the Senate forced upon Eisenhower with the Bricker Amendment in 1954. But President Nixon avoided another clash with the Senate because he did not have the votes and chose instead to rely on the House to defeat the bill. The House, however, wanted war powers legislation too. In the end, the White House did not have to exert itself because the House and Senate could not agree on a compromise bill. The bill died with the 92nd Congress in October. Undoubtedly the bill will be revised next year but differences will remain between the House and Senate versions.

There are two war power bills. Something of the debate between the House and Senate bills was caught in Congressman FASCELL's rejoinder to Senator Eagleton. Unfortunately, Congressman FASCELL's remarks were brief so your readers missed the full flavor of a great debate over the war powers of Congress and the President. Unlike the debate on the Bricker Amendment, the debate this time is between the House and the Senate. The President is an onlooker—he probably will not be able to defeat the House bill, and he has little choice but to encourage the House to water down the Senate bill.

Congressman FASCELL points out that the Senate bill may prove counter-productive because it authorizes the President to repel attacks upon the United States, U.S. armed forces abroad, and American nationals in foreign countries. It actually gives him a broad grant of power. Senator Fulbright has made the same argument and would prefer to let the President scrape together his own rationales for emergency action without implicating Congress. Senator Eagleton is rely-

ing entirely on a calendar methodology to bring Congress into partnership with the President. In the Senate bill, the President will have 30 days to obtain congressional approval for the actions he has already taken. As Congressman FASCELL mentions, however, the energy released by an international crisis could easily blow down the 30-day wall the Senate bill erects and overcome the Congress with pleas for patriotic support of the President. The Senate bill has Congress acting too late to be effective.

The Senate bill is structured around the 30-day provision in order to avoid stepping on the President's constitutional powers to act in an emergency. Congressman FASCELL would agree, I suspect, with the Senate's desire to avoid a constitutional crisis between the executive and legislative branches, a danger lurking in the war powers debate that Senator Goldwater alludes to at the very end of his remarks. The House bill takes a different approach. It creates a structure for influencing the President before he acts which I would argue is the only way for Congress to be effective.

So the issue is drawn between the two bills on whether to rely on a formal 30-day authorization provision which is triggered late or on an informal reporting requirement which is triggered early for exercising Congress' war powers. The debate next year will begin from these starting positions. Perhaps, if the fire is taken out of the Senate bill and a little more heat put in the House bill, a compromise will emerge. At the moment, nobody is talking compromise. Will there be a bill or will we in the audience be left with just another rhetorical exercise which too frequently covers Congress' failure to act?

H.J. RES. 2

Joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This measure may be cited as the "War Powers Resolution of 1973".

PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress herewith reaffirms its powers under the Constitution to declare war. At the same time, the Congress recognizes that the President in certain extraordinary and emergency circumstances has the authority to defend the United States and its citizens without specific prior authorization by the Congress.

EMERGENCY USE OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 3. In the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress, the Armed Forces of the United States may be introduced in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, only—

(1) to respond to any act or situation that endangers the United States, its territories or possessions, or its citizens or nationals when the necessity to respond to such act or situation in the judgment of the President constitutes an extraordinary and emergency circumstances as do not permit advance Congressional authorization to employ such forces; or

(2) pursuant to specific prior authorization, by statute or concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress.

CONSULTATION

SEC. 4. The President, when acting pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this resolution, should seek appropriate consultation with the Congress before introducing the Armed Forces of the United States into hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated. Consultation should continue periodically during such armed conflict.

REPORTING

SEC. 5. In any case in which the President without a declaration of war by the Congress—

(1) commits United States military forces to armed conflict;

(2) commits military forces equipped for combat to the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation, except for deployments which relate solely to supply, repair, or training of United States forces, or for humanitarian or other peaceful purposes; or

(3) substantially enlarges military forces already located in a foreign nation;

the President shall submit promptly to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate a report, in writing, setting forth—

(A) the circumstances necessitating his action;

(B) the constitutional, legislative, and treaty provisions under the authority of which he took such action, together with his reasons for not seeking specific prior congressional authorization;

(C) the estimated scope of activities; and

(D) such other information as the President may deem useful to the Congress in the fulfillment of its constitutional responsibilities with respect to committing the Nation to war and to the use of the United States Armed Forces abroad.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

SEC. 6. Whenever a report is submitted by the President pursuant to this resolution, both Houses of Congress shall proceed immediately to the consideration of the question of whether Congress shall authorize the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and the expenditure of funds for purposes relating to those hostilities or imminent hostilities cited in the report.

Whenever the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate receive such a report and the Congress is not in session, the President shall convene Congress in order that it may consider the report and take appropriate action.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY

SEC. 7. This resolution shall take effect on the date of its enactment. Nothing in this resolution is intended to alter constitutional authority of the Congress or of the President, or the provisions of existing treaties. At the same time nothing in this resolution should be construed to represent congressional acceptance of the proposition that Executive action alone can satisfy the constitutional process requirement contained in the provisions of mutual security treaties to which the United States is a party.

FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE MARKS
ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year on its anniversary the U.S. Civil Service Commission has an honors ceremony when it gives recognition to individual employees for their dedication and special achievements in their work.

This year, the ceremony had dual significance since last Tuesday marked the 90th anniversary of the Federal Civil Service. The Civil Service Act, also known as the Pendleton Act, was signed into law

by President Chester A. Arthur on January 16, 1883.

This law established the basic charter for the Federal merit system and Federal career service. From its limited scope at the outset, the system has developed over the years to insure full recognition of merit in connection with appointments and promotions and has encouraged Federal employment as a career.

Ninety years of progress have seen the development of an outstanding system of Federal employment. I join in saluting the Civil Service Commission and all Federal employees on this proud occasion.

It was most appropriate that the main speaker at the honors ceremony on Tuesday should be the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Elmer B. Staats who took a very incisive look at public service—90 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I am including Mr. Staats' excellent text as a part of my remarks.

President Nixon also paid tribute to the 90th anniversary of the Federal civil service in a statement issued in connection with the ceremony. I also am including that text with my remarks.

EDWARD DUNTON HONORED

The Commissioners' Award for Distinguished Service, the Civil Service Commission's highest honor, was conferred on its Deputy Executive Director, Edward A. Dunton. In making the award, which is done only in "most exceptional cases," the Commission said of Mr. Dunton:

An outstanding partner in directing the total program of the Commission, he has given new meaning to "creative management" and "total response."

The imprint of his career-long efforts to achieve operating improvements and economies is most evident in recruiting and examining, equal employment opportunity, personnel management evaluation, intergovernmental relations, and appeals.

Typical is his tough-minded managerial response to the Administration's recent call for greater economy of operations, and the outstanding performance he obtained from the Commission's field organization in staffing the Office of Emergency Preparedness to manage the wage-price freeze.

A man of great intelligence and selfless application of time and talent, he has distinguished himself as "manager for all seasons."

Among those honored by the Commission were the six associated executives and all staff members of the Commission's Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs for their work in connection with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970.

Distinguished citizen awards were presented to Charles A. Byrley, Director, National Governors Conference; Breward E. Cribfield, Executive Director, Council of State Governments; John Gunther, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors; Bernard F. Hillenbrand, Executive Director, National Association of Counties; Mark E. Keane, Executive Director, International City Management Association; and Allen E. Pritchard, Executive Vice President, National League of Cities.

A group citation was presented to all employees of the Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs for their

"exceptional record of achievement in bringing to life the provisions of the Act."

EMPLOYEES ARE CITED

Special citations for outstanding performance by individuals were presented to the following Commission employees:

Mary K. Coughlin, manager of the Rapid City, S. Dak., area office, for her work during the 1972 floods which devastated the Rapid City area.

William E. Cristy, supervisory personnel staffing specialist, Pittsburgh area office, for his work while serving as Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the Pittsburgh Federal Executive Board.

Dora M. Flaim, supervisory investigator and chief of the processing and rating section, San Francisco region, for her dual role, and her managerial effectiveness in the region's successful investigative program.

Wilmer R. Haack, special assistant to the chief, claims division, Bureau of Retirement, Insurance, and Occupational Health, for his efficient technical direction of a new, streamlined system for processing annuity payments.

William R. King, director, Oak Ridge Executive Seminar Center, for his capable management and high standards of performance in establishing the center.

Katherine Schwarzmann, personnel management specialist, Bureau of Policies and Standards, for her role as a consummate professional in the field of Federal salary legislation.

Lee V. Venzor, director, Southwest Interagency Training Center, Dallas region, for his leadership in founding the center which has moved quickly and effectively to carry out the President's program for assisting Spanish-speaking Americans.

Harold L. Whitfield, equal employment opportunity representative, St. Louis region, for his results-oriented approach and direct program leadership.

Robert F. Alles, transcription unit supervisor, and Robert J. Sniogowski, supervisory clerk, Wilkes-Barre area investigative reports transcription center, for the exceptional efforts of these two men during a 2-week period of flood crisis to assure the safety of employees and the security of work at the center.

In the Bureau of Recruiting and Examining, Keith A. Roelofs, chief, administrative management division; Donald A. Storck, director, office of examining systems; John F. Daley, program analysis officer; and Laurence Lorenz, personnel staffing specialist, for their major roles in the development and implementation of the Wide-Area Telephone Service—WATS—for improving operations of the Federal job information system.

The above-mentioned materials follow:

ADDRESS BY ELMER B. STAATS, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, ON 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

President Kennedy frequently told the story of a French marshal who asked his gardener one day to plant a tree. The gardener protested—"It will take a hundred years to grow." "In that case, we have no time to lose," the marshal responded. "Plant it this afternoon."

In 10 years, the Pendleton Act of 1883, which established the basic charter for the

Federal merit system and Federal career service, will be 100 years old. It is well to remind ourselves on this 90th birthday of the act that it took nearly 100 years to bring into the legislation which has meant so much to the American people.

Although we have much to be proud of in the growth and strengthening of the Federal merit system tree, we cannot be confident that it will continue to thrive without continued attention and support. Without these the system will fail to achieve the objectives of those who fought so long and so hard for the basic reforms.

It was their hope that the merit system would serve all of the Nation better and that the interests of all would be served when all had equal opportunity to compete; when advancement was based on recognized achievement; and when Government was able to obtain the services of adequate, skilled and loyal employees required for the Nation's security and prosperity.

As all can see, we have travelled a long way from the days of Andrew Jackson who held the view that public offices were "plain and simple" and who liked to campaign on the slogan "To the victor belong the spoils."

Today we cannot have a strong economy and a viable society without representative, responsible, effective Government. We can have this kind of Government only if it is made up of able people dedicated to advancing the basic principles on which our institutions are established.

The late Clarence Randall (formerly head of the Inland Steel Corporation) who did so much to help Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to bring about improved pay for Federal employees, summed up the realistic view of modern Government, in contrast to Jackson's day, in these words:

"The ultimate effectiveness of our governmental process, whether in Washington, or in the State capitals, or in the city halls, rests squarely on the quality of the career officers, the permanent Civil Service."

In a similar vein, the late Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower Administration, stated that:

"We can have strong Government only as it is made up of able people, and we think not alone of the top few, or of those in major elective office. . . . The need for competence applies across the entire spectrum of Government operations. It applies equally to men and women in elective status, in career administrative positions and appointed positions."

Government today carries the primary responsibility for advancing the Nation's efforts to improve science and technology; it is deeply involved in efforts to eliminate poverty; to provide manpower training to the disadvantaged; and to improve education at every age level.

We have a national commitment to explore space and the depths of the oceans. We are trying to find ways to make our cities more livable and our transportation systems workable. We have embarked on programs to deal with our critical shortages of energy and to improve our environment—both required for the improvement of our standard of living.

In these and in a host of other areas, all of us in government have an opportunity to serve the Nation. At the end of the day, the end of the week, the end of the year, or perhaps at the end of a career, we should be able to look back and say:

"I am proud to have been a public servant, to have dealt with the problems of our time and to have had a part, however small, in contributing to their solution."

Despite its long history and the many tributes which have been paid to our Federal career service, it is still a fragile thing. It has few constituents. All too frequently the accolades go to those who choose to denounce the so-called bureaucrats and those who

capitalize on what, unfortunately, is still a widely held view—that the Government is made up of incompetents or worse.

Mistakes, most would agree, are made in government as well as outside government. Most would agree also that not all individuals are of equal competence or motivation, either inside or outside government. But issuing blanket condemnations and blanket criticisms can only damage, rather than improve, the quality of government, Federal, State or local.

These detractors might point out that in the Federal Government productivity per man year increased at an average annual rate of 1.9 percent between 1967 and 1971 instead of a zero rate which many had alleged.

They might point out that during this past year over 200,000, or approximately one out of 12 Federal employees at all levels, performed in such a superior manner that they merited monetary or other recognition.

This recognition was not limited to those at the top. For example:

A clerk-typist, GS-3, with the Defense Supply Agency voluntarily developed and presented a Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Program. He devoted his own time and made public his personal experience with drug addiction, which benefited not only employees of his agency but members of his community as well.

A nurse, GS-9, with NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston assisted in developing the necessary checks and tests for astronauts which were required to obtain man's reaction to outer space. This earned her not only numerous NASA honors but led to her being named one of the outstanding women in America in 1971.

A Job Corps teacher, GS-9, was recognized for outstanding work in teaching and motivating men who could neither read nor write. Her efforts placed a high percentage of these men on the road to self-sufficient jobs.

These critics might point also to awards for outstanding service made annually by The National Civil Service League, an organization which had so much to do with the original enactment of the Pendleton Act. Here are some examples:

An astronomer was given an award for doing much of the basic research essential to our national space program, for directing the optical tracking system for the first artificial space satellite, and for directing the production of an astronomical telescope which extended our knowledge of the universe.

A director of personnel of the Veterans Administration, one of the outstanding women in the Federal service, was recognized for her exceptional work in equal employment for minorities, for developing work opportunities for veterans and handicapped, and for her leadership in one of the largest organizations of the Government.

One of the first black Marines who served as Chief of the Conciliation Division of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was cited for his outstanding work with the Nation's largest industrial organizations in bringing about increased recruitment, selection, and promotion for minorities.

Recognitions such as these are important. They make the average citizen aware that there are many able public servants who work long hours, frequently without recognition, to solve the most complex problems of this period in our history. But more needs to be done. We need more Clarence Randalls and Neil McElroys who are willing to say what is right about the career service—not just what is wrong.

How else can we persuade the best products of our colleges and universities to seek Government employment? How else can we motivate our best people to stay in the Government service? How else can we create the incentives to increase productivity? How else

can we find solutions to the problems which Government is called upon to resolve?

Many ingredients are required for a vital, productive, responsive career service. No one has ever fully identified all of these ingredients or their variations—why one unit has a higher productivity than another doing exactly the same work, why employee morale varies so much from agency to agency, why one individual works harder than another, or why turnover is so much higher in one bureau than in another. These are important questions and we need to know a lot more than we do today before we can obtain satisfactory answers.

Leadership is obviously vital. This includes the establishment of realistic but high goals understood by all.

Recognition is important when these goals are made or exceeded.

A pay system is important to provide assurance of equitable compensation.

Job enrichment is important to increase job satisfaction and challenge.

Equal opportunity is important, not only in the selection of employees but in their advancement.

Reasonable opportunity for self-improvement is important through rotation, training, and education.

This is perhaps but a beginning of a long list. I believe most would agree that these are among the most important areas of concern to career employees. These areas are also of special concern to the Civil Service Commission, the President, the Congress, and employee organizations.

But perhaps most important of all in creating job satisfaction and high output is the quality of supervision at all levels. The supervisor holds so many of the keys to performance: (1) productive working relationships, (2) effective communication, (3) resolving day-to-day problems, and, last but not least, (4) fairness.

Whether the supervisor does these things well or poorly can make a critical difference in whether programs succeed or fail. This is undoubtedly why the Civil Service Commission has, correctly, devoted so much attention to how these men and women are selected, how they are trained, and how well they perform.

Leadership has yet another dimension—a third dimension—and that is the developing of a viable relationship between the policy official and the career officer. This relationship has been the subject of much public and private expression by at least the past five Presidents, to my personal knowledge.

Is or is not the career service supporting the policies set forth by the top leadership? We hear statements to the effect that the career service tries to be accountable only to itself and takes the attitude that, if it waits long enough, there will be a new election, a new cabinet officer, and a new agency head who may be more agreeable to its viewpoint.

That these statements are made, I have no doubt. What I doubt is that these views are held widely either by policy officials or by individuals in the career service. The real problem is one of communication and an adequate recognition that the Federal Government is today extraordinarily complex. Both the career official and the policy official should have one thing in common—a desire to make that Government work, and work well.

To make the Federal Government work as it should, the career service must be responsive to policy changes. It has another obligation—to make certain that top leadership understands when past experience might make a modification in plans, or proposed programs, desirable to achieve policy objectives.

This duty would include, of course, suggesting alternatives which might achieve those policy objectives better than original proposals. My own experience over more than 30 years in both career and policy positions

is that there is no substitute for effective communication of purpose and objectives if a reciprocal relationship is to be effective—communication and understanding, back and forth.

That means communication upward as well as communication downward. If we try to say that one part of the work belongs to the political people, the administration, and that another part belongs to the career service, we will quickly be in trouble. The line between policy and administration is never that clear cut.

This does not mean that the career service has to engage in partisan politics—quite the contrary. A former Budget Director, under whom I served as a career staff member, used to say to us that we should be “politically aware,” not “politically active.”

Political awareness has to be a part of the required knowledge of the career servant, just as the policy official has to understand the great value of professional judgments and experience of the career service in administering programs. This is the essence of participative management. This is its basic principle in the Federal Government.

It has worked well in every organization where it has been seriously tried, public or private. This is the way to avoid mutual suspicions perhaps harmful to all. It is the kind of management participation which should be freely sought by the policy official and freely offered by the career officer.

It has been a habit for decades for some civil servants to label a policy official as “politician”—in a very special tone of voice; and for some political appointees to refer to one in the career service as a “bureaucrat”—also in a very special tone of voice.

A friend of mine once observed that it was a curious and interesting habit among Americans that they sometimes used bad words for good things. That observation certainly applies in this case for I believe both recognize, more and more, that without one another neither can be successful.

I am not arguing that the relationship between the political level and the career service should be—or ever could be—all sweetness and light. That is not the nature of the matter. It isn't reality; it isn't even healthy. I hope I never see the day when Government is so tranquilized, so sedated, that it is out on its feet. I will take a good argument any time—the taste of mustard, the whiff of cordite—because the final answer will come out better.

There is going to be tension in the relationship between political appointees and career people. There ought to be. The most we should ask is that it be a *workable* relationship, not a comfortable one, not even an equal one. This two-part relationship is here to stay and the problems of making it work aren't very different from one administration to another.

If making it work seems harder than it used to be, there are several reasons. For the Government today, the stakes are higher, the scale is magnified, and the whole process of governing is more exposed and accountable. The buffer zone between politics and public service is extremely difficult to determine.

Remember that much has happened since the Pendleton Act. The Government has come a long way from providing simple conveniences and services that were neutral. Today, there is no area of American life and action where the Government's influence is not felt. It is this that has changed the role of the public service. What government does, how it does it, and to whom are matters of no small importance. They are political questions. So the terms on which the public service operates today are not the same as they were 90 years ago.

In observing this 90th birthday of the Civil

Service Act, let us make certain that we are not oriented more to the past than to the future. Sometimes we in government act as if it is the *past* which can be changed rather than the *future*. To be sure the past must be understood if we are to recognize the forces of change.

What I am attempting to say—and feel it appropriate to say it on this occasion—is that as Federal Government servants we run the risk of being tied too much to the past. We tend to do things in the traditional ways. We fail to question why things cannot be done better. We may fail to realize that situations have changed and that new solutions or new ideas are called for. But, above all, the challenge is to do our job better, to find ways of improving our own capabilities.

It is not enough to be judged good at doing our daily work—to have a satisfactory performance rating. We want to be able to look back 10 years from today—your 100th anniversary—and know that the public service is better because *we* were there. This will be done only in proportion to our efforts to broaden our understanding of the parts which we play, to improve our skills, and to know how our efforts relate to the changing role of the agencies in which we work.

Innovation, change, education—these are the familiar words describing our reaction to today's shifting scenes. We cannot avoid change and we would not want to. But just as nuclear energy must be controlled and channeled to be useful, so must change be guided through social institutions and organizations to meet the goals and objectives which history and past experience dictate as meeting the moral and ethical needs of society.

Government—which you and I represent—is probably the most important of these institutions. We have people with that kind of understanding in this room. Government in the coming years will need as many people as possible with that kind of vision in solving the complicated problems that arise in our mass society—arresting the rising costs of education, public health, and welfare; rebuilding the cities; reducing poverty to its lowest level; and developing a higher sense of unity in our society.

This is the challenge of public service. In one way or another it has always been so and, as I said at the start, I suppose always will. Public service is more than an occupational category. It is the discovery, as Harold Laski put it long ago, that men serve themselves only as they serve others.

Could any of us give a better reason for choosing a career in the Civil Service of the United States?

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Ninety years ago today President Chester A. Arthur signed into law the Civil Service Act of 1883. It is with pride in the quality of our Nation's civil servants that we celebrate the signing of that measure which brought sweeping reform in the civil service and has shaped the character of public service in America as nothing else has, before or since.

In observing the 90th anniversary of that landmark law, we acknowledge its wisdom in establishing principles of merit as the foundation for employment in the public service. The Civil Service Act made individual ability the basis for civil service employment, thus putting an end to the disruptions of Government business caused by frequent turnovers of employees and helping to assure competence and equal opportunity throughout the Federal establishment.

As we reach this milestone, we must recognize that a new and equally demanding challenge now faces us: to renew and revitalize our entire system of government. We

must return a share of our power in Washington to our States and local communities, and with a leaner Federal work force, make our national programs much more effective. These tasks will require hard work and dedication from us all.

Judging from the distinguished record of our civil service employees over the past ninety years, I am confident that our career managers and other civil service personnel are more than equal to the task. I look forward to working with the civil service community during the coming years, and I ask you to join me in carrying out my hope of making the next four years the best four years in America's history.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE STATUS OF JERUSALEM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, of the many complicated issues involved in a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the future status of the city of Jerusalem is, perhaps, the most sensitive and a solution for the city most difficult to achieve. On January 4, 1973, I asked the Secretary of State what was U.S. policy toward Jerusalem today and whether any changes in that policy had taken place in the last year or so or might take place in the near future.

My letter and the State Department's reply follow:

JANUARY 4, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM F. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: To my knowledge, there has been no clear United States statement on Israeli policies toward the city of Jerusalem since June 1971 when a State Department spokesman indicated that construction of new housing in East Jerusalem by the Israelis violated a 1946 Geneva Convention of which Israel was a signatory.

I would like to inquire as to what is United States Policy toward the city of Jerusalem today and toward its future status. In particular, does the United States consider East Jerusalem an Occupied Territory (East Jerusalem defined as that portion of the city under Jordanian control prior to 1967)? Does the United States recognize any Israeli sovereignty in the eastern portion of the city? And is the United States considering moving its embassy in Tel Aviv to Jerusalem?

I would appreciate an early response to this request.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,

Chairman,

Subcommittee on the Near East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., January 17, 1973.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Near East Subcommittee, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Rogers has asked me to reply to your January 4 letter requesting a current statement of United States policy on the question of Jerusalem.

Although new circumstances have arisen in Jerusalem as a result of the June 1967 war, there has been no change in our basic position on the question of the status of the city. In his briefing on June 9, 1971 the Department spokesman stated, with respect to

"constructing housing and other permanent civilian facilities in the occupied zone, including Jerusalem, our policy is to call for strict observance of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, to which Israel is a party." Thus, we regard Israel's role in East Jerusalem to be that of a military occupier and Israel's responsibilities there, as well as in all of the territories which came under Israeli control during the June 1967 war, to be governed by pertinent international law including the 1949 Geneva Conventions.

The 1949 General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan left the city of Jerusalem divided between those two countries, and the question of the permanent status of the city was held in abeyance pending a final peace settlement. The United States has never recognized unilateral actions by any of the states in the area as governing the international status of Jerusalem. We have, however, dealt with authorities of Israel and Jordan on a practical basis. In addition, we have consistently maintained that there must be free access to the holy places under fair and effective arrangements.

It is our belief that the ultimate status of Jerusalem can only be determined as a part of the entire complex of issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict. A solution to the problem, which in our view should be based on the principle of a unified city with guaranteed rights of free access, must be sought in the context of an overall settlement of the conflict and must be based upon agreement reached among the parties concerned. In practical terms this means primarily the Governments of Israel and Jordan, taking into account the interests of other countries in the area and of the international community.

Any proposal to acknowledge the city of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel or to move our Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem must be considered in light of the foregoing factors. I believe it is clear that such a move, by giving the impression that we had prejudged an ultimate settlement, would have far reaching policy implications which would inhibit our ability to play a constructive role in the search for a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 1972, the people of Somerset and Pulaski County, Ky., paid special recognition to their distinguished native son—the Honorable John Sherman Cooper.

Throughout his fine career, former Senator Cooper has sought to bring about a better world for all people. His deep concern for his fellow human beings is well known among the citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The love and respect that our people have for this great American has been exhibited through many tributes during recent months.

A part of the special recognition on September 10, was the establishment of the John Sherman Cooper Student Aid Fund by the Somerset-Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce. Funds will be

invested by the University of Kentucky, and the interest derived will be used by the Somerset Community College to assist local students in furthering their education at the college. Provision will be made for scholarships, grants, loans, matching Federal moneys, and various other student aid programs.

I commend the people of Pulaski County, Ky., for this tribute to John Sherman Cooper, and I invite others who wish to participate to contact the Somerset-Pulaski County, Ky., Chamber of Commerce.

LAYMAN'S SUNDAY SERMON

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, Tom Henry, a prominent attorney in La Jolla, California, presented the Layman's Sunday sermon at the St. James Episcopal Church there.

His remarks are particularly relevant in these troubled times of youth unrest and family dissolution and I am pleased to have the opportunity to share his challenging address with my House colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD worldwide.

The remarks follows:

LAYMAN'S SUNDAY SERMON

(By Thomas A. Henry, Jr.)

I acknowledge my gratitude to Father Bob for offering me the opportunity to speak on this Advent Sunday—Layman's Sunday. Perhaps when you hear my message you will think that you have just experienced "Stir-up Sunday." That is my hope, at least. After spending hours of preparation on this task, I have come to the conclusion that Layman's Sunday is a clerical device to gain the Layman's sympathy for the Clergy. It is indeed a job and the clergy certainly does have my sympathy.

I also want to acknowledge the dedicated service of Father Fred. I can say without the slightest hesitancy that I completely support his work in this Parish with our young people. If Father Fred could capsule his ability to communicate with young people, there surely would be no need for me to stand up here and discuss with you problems such as my topic today: The New Ethic; its effect on understanding among parents, child and Christ, and an answer to its challenge.

The New Ethic seems to be gaining acceptance among our young people today. Its philosophy is distinguished from that of the Christian Ethic which centers around the concept of a corporate and personal involvement with each other and Christ. The New Ethic tends to cut our young people adrift from many of the institutions which have served as reference points in our lives—institutions such as home, church, school and community. It causes our family influence to fade, resulting in a rejection of the familiar disciplines and traditional values. It denigrates work and is excessively tolerant towards sexual morality and drugs. It advocates that the rule of law is anathema to man's free spirit. Its life style is highly individualized self-interest, without consequence or guilt for ones actions.

Religion, under this ethic, is irrelevant and, to quote Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell, from a recent address of his to the American Bar Association:

"America is categorized under this ethic as a wholly selfish, materialistic, racist society with unworthy goals and warped priorities."

Unfortunately, this New Ethic provides the non-competitive, insecure young person with a convenient cop-out—an excuse to do his own thing. It creates an entire new class of non-achievers and anti-social dropouts who are sanctified by the euphemism "Ethic," which, in its literal definition, means moral principles and values.

From my own personal experience here at St. James, working with our young people for 3 years now, I can happily say that the New Ethic has found little or no acceptance among the young people in our programs. Of course, our youth programs are attended by only a small percentage of all of the young people of families in our parish and I can't speak for those who have not participated in our youth programs.

So, I suppose I should offer my congratulations and admiration for those parents here who have survived or avoided the New Ethic to this point. I envy those families who have come through the adolescent period in one piece—tested and battered a bit, but relatively unscathed. So all of you veterans can sit back and leaf through your prayer books or hold hands with your wives and I'll talk to those of us who really are in need of help.

Life must be lonely indeed for persons who subscribe to the philosophy of the New Ethic and it's easy to understand why young minds are fair game to the demagogues who espouse it. Once the idea of sole responsibility to oneself is accepted and traditional values and institutions are doubted, rebellion occurs and the cold estrangement of mistrust and hate follows. Conduct then, is manifested in drug abuse, sexual promiscuity and delinquency, and behavior is rationalized by blaming others for creating the seeds of the doubter's discontent. A withdrawal occurs into the fragile cocoon of self-dependence which will most surely lie dormant and unfulfilled forever. Sadly, we all probably know of such wasting lives.

My most recent experience with this situation involved father, mother and daughter—aged 16. Father Very Busy—Mother Very Social and daughter Very Much Alone and convinced—at least outwardly—that she had all the answers—convinced at least until she became pregnant. The recriminations and blame passing between parent and child were endless but the fact remained that new life had been created by one determined to do her own thing. The question which had to be answered was what to do with the baby—as yet unborn. What a tragedy that a 16 year old has to answer that question—a bitter lesson indeed for all concerned.

One almost has to believe that life has little or no meaning to a person who believes that man can, in fact, be an island and live alone, without a faith in his fellow man and God. Jean Paul Sartre, in his, "Speech of the Dead Christ From the Buildings of the World," describes the terrible vision of a world without God as "Finiteness Chewing Its Own Cud." A very frightening prospect indeed. The dimension of life after death and hope for eternity which God offers is nonexistent in this vision.

But, as our young people say, our world is imperfect. I acknowledge the problems of the world and I also acknowledge the fact that this is not the first time that men have been baffled, bereft and lonely. Throughout history, due to change and discovery, and the development of new theories, men have felt unsure and they have had to go on believing by faith what they could not prove, in fact. Without a faith in God, how would such belief be founded and without faith in one's fellow man and belief in the value of interreaction with that person, how can there be faith in God?

Paraphrasing the 31st Psalm:

In Thee O Lord do I seek refuge. Incline thine ear to me. Take me out of the net that is hidden from me. Into Thy hands I commit my spirit. Thou has set my feet in a large room.

This message gives us hope and faith that eternity will be there for us but, it also indicates that our life here on earth is nevertheless, full of the unknown, an unseen net, a bewildering vastness, which seems incredibly boundless and immeasurable. Thou has set my feet in a large room but my spirit is committed to Thee. An abiding faith is evidenced by this Psalm and is hope for us all.

Shall we allow our youth, in the hopelessness and despair of the New Ethic philosophy, to shut themselves up or, shall we turn toward our problems together and recommit ourselves to their solutions, using our need for each other and our faith in our God, as our cornerstones. Are we going to join the creative and constructive revolution or are we going to be left by the wayside as the New Ethic would have it, hopelessly captured by our own self-interests and involved in a self-destructive negative backlash. Are we going to face reality, admitting and redefining our problems and analyzing the issues and bringing all possible energies and resources to bear in solving them, or are we going to concede to the dropouts their right to doing their own thing? If you admit that our problems are ones of great dynamic change and not ones of decay, there can be only one answer.

Turning from philosophy to practical application, what can we, as parents do, as the custodians of the young, to insure that the New Ethic does not replace the Christian Ethic in our families and lives?

In the first place, we have to stop parroting this popular notion which says that our children are the best educated in the history of man. I don't believe it and we almost say it as if we were trying to convince ourselves. All too often, this acknowledgement is made to soothe the conscience of the adult who has abdicated his responsibility with the education of his child. By education, of course, I mean not only scholarship but the process whereby the child is taught at home as well as in school. Too many of us believe that a child's education begins and ends in the little red schoolhouse. There can be no question that young people are smarter today, intellectually, and that only enables them to more easily see through us as parents. It makes our job all the tougher.

It's hard to believe, with all the broken homes in California today, and with the rate of dissolution of marriage increasing, that there could be anything but a decrease in the over-all educational level of our children. The casual concern of many young people for the stewardship of their own health, expressed through the incidence of drug use and the promiscuity leading to the epidemic of venereal disease from which San Diego County is suffering today, is but mere evidence of this educational lack. By the way—here is a fact which might interest you. The supervisor in charge of the Youth Service Bureau here in La Jolla—an organization which I am proud to say we, as Parish, support—tells me that drug use in the child is often linked directly to alcohol abuse in the parent. The hypocritical parent who believes that the child will do as the parent says and not as the parent does—is truly a fool.

Once we've accepted the possibility that our children may not be as well educated as we thought, we as parents must involve ourselves in more positive efforts with them. How can a parent expect a child to understand concepts such as personal responsibility, respect for work, pride in country, faith in God, honesty and loyalty, unless these

concepts are discussed and practiced on a daily basis in the home? This, of course, takes a great deal of time and we are all busy people. We must also thoughtfully consider their points of view so that they will feel that they have been part of the decision making process within our families. The family that fails to do this will soon see the defensive attitude of a child manifested in disrespect—not only for the family but for all authority. There can be no respect for authority unless the reasoning behind authority is understood and respected for what it seeks to accomplish and, I submit that this training must be discharged and fostered within the family unit through mutual involvement of child and parent in planning and living.

The potential capabilities of our young people are limited only by the bounds of space and perhaps extend even beyond that. As the tree which is cared for and blooms in the Spring will surely bear fruit in the Fall, we as parents need to become an intimate part of the growth of our children, so that they will become responsible adults. Our guidance will give them tools and skills to enable them to soundly construct their own lives, taking and leaving from the past, that which they feel is necessary to the achievement of their goals. This wisdom of experience can best be brought to young people by loving and interested parents. Can we resolve today to become more involved with our children and to help them better equip themselves for acceptance of our great world with all of its wonders and—yes—with its mysteries and problems as well.

God and our faith in Him as Christians can make the job so much easier for us here on earth and that is the challenge of the church today. In this large room into which we have all been placed, the Church must serve as the catalyst in the rapprochement and reconciliation of our families, through understanding, faith and love of God. It's not too late to stem the tide of the new ethic and with a dedicated reassertion of our family responsibilities, under God's guidance, we can accomplish much together as one. John F. Kennedy, in concluding his inaugural address put the whole idea in brief perspective:

"Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessings and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

In the name of God, amen.

COURT SYSTEM

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, too often in recent years we have been told that a seriously undermanned and overburdened Federal court system threatens the quality of justice in this country. It has become increasingly imperative, therefore, that Congress move quickly toward an examination and evaluation of these problems.

For that reason, I am today introducing two bills recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States. The first of these would create 11 new circuit judgeships for the Federal Courts of Appeals; the second would provide 51 new Federal District judgeships.

In considering this legislation, it is my

hope that Congress will make its own judgment of current needs, based on a consideration of the number of vital factors such as filings, terminations, weighted cases, and docket backlogs that determine the workload of Federal courts.

NEED FOR INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL SERVICE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently requested that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the General Accounting Office conduct an in-depth investigation of the U.S. Postal Service. Correspondence reaching my office has indicated to me that not only is the American public losing confidence in the mails, but in fact the deteriorating service is already having damaging effects on business. I have received letters from all over the country describing overdrawn and canceled accounts due to delay of payments in the mails. The point has already been reached when anyone doing business with a deadline is hesitant to use the mails, and with good reason.

In a recent editorial, WPTV television of Palm Beach, Fla. called attention to this growing problem. I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE BILL GORDON REPORT

(This report was aired on January 5, 1973)

A Washington-based radio network reporter this morning quoted postal officials as claiming that the average first-class letter is delivered within a day-and-a-half.

But, to paraphrase what the character known as the "old timer" used to say to Fibber McGee and Molly, "That ain't the way we heard it." And neither is it the way a lot of us have been receiving our mail; or our congressman his, either.

We have in hand, but probably only because it was delivered by a member of his staff, a notice from Representative Paul Rogers that he's requested an investigation of the postal service on grounds that the deterioration of that service is "adversely affecting business and commerce." We suspect he might have been tempted to use some stronger language; of the kind his constituents have recently been heard to voice in connection with the mail service; but then, Congressman Rogers is aware of the restrictions on what we can say and print.

In calling for an investigation, he cites some of the cases he's personally experienced and some of those which have come to his attention. Like the letter that took from September 18th until December 15th to make it from Palm Beach to an office across the lake in West Palm's Harvey Building. That's about a half-mile as the crow flies. But the postal service with its regional sorting center concept seems to have forgotten that such a straight line is still the shortest distance between two points. We became convinced of that when we began receiving some locally-dispatched letters bearing a Miami postmark.

Actually, the main effect of this sort of thing on us and our business has been the sometimes late, or occasionally too-late no-

tice of a news event. In one instance we recall that even a post office notice of a holiday closing arrived after the fact. So, at least we know there's no favoritism involved.

But, as Congressman Rogers notes, there have been some instances where the effects have been of a more serious nature, particularly in those cases where legal and business deadlines were involved.

No doubt a great many persons could add ammunition of their own to the growing postal service complaint file.

And ordinarily, we'd urge that they write their congressman. But under the circumstances, Lord only knows when he'd get it.

HON. COURTLAND PERKINS, DEAN OF ENGINEERING, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, ADDRESSES LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at a luncheon meeting held on January 9, 1973, by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics in honor of Members of both the House and Senate Committees on Science and Astronautics, Prof. Courtland Perkins delivered a most interesting talk entitled "A Look at Our National Space Program." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of Professor Perkins' remarks:

A LOOK AT OUR NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM
(By C. D. Perkins)

Mr. President—honored guests—ladies and gentlemen:

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a great pleasure for me to participate in this important annual meeting of the AIAA and an honor for me to be able to address this important luncheon meeting on certain aspects of our national space program. A program at a very difficult crossroads, particularly with respect to our National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). It is fifteen years since the organization of NASA and the start of the build up of space programs by NASA and by the military. We have witnessed on both sides a succession of successes that are truly astonishing—yet today we are all unsure of what we have accomplished and where this leads us.

This afternoon I want to make these points:

1. It is important to preserve in some fashion the great competence built up within NASA—thru its manned space program.

2. It is important to agree on NASA's role for the future and better delineate its operational and technical responsibilities and

3. We must do something to intrigue our best young minds back to important areas of technology and science.

Any discussion of space activities today can hardly help but start from consideration of the Apollo program completed so magnificently last month. I believe all will agree that the total NASA manned program culminating in Apollo 17 was the most spectacular technical achievement that the world has witnessed to date, and certainly achieved Apollo's great objective set out by President Kennedy in 1961 to land a man on the moon and recover him safely before 1970. This was a startling goal and a great target that focused our national attention—occupied

many of our best minds—motivated our young scholars—and funded as a by product, many things that we could never have done otherwise. It has been a brilliant success and achieved its major objective of demonstrating our technical prowess to the world and with equal importance, to ourselves. We stand in awe of this great accomplishment and only wonder at what do we do now?

2. THE ENVIRONMENT THAT CREATED APOLLO

It is very difficult to understand Apollo if one had not lived through the events of the 1950s. At the end of World War II and up into the early 50s this country was convinced that it had no competition in science and technology and its prestige and self respect were monumental. Hadn't we perfected radar, developed the A and H bombs, the intercontinental bomber, television and others?

Then in swift succession we received three tremendous jolts that shook the country to its foundation. First the Russians whom we felt would take years to develop nuclear weapons showed that they were close behind us and in fact almost exploded their first hydrogen device before we did.

Shortly thereafter our intelligence sources discovered that the Russians were experimenting with and developing ballistic missiles with ranges and payload making ICBMs a near reality. This information received our instant attention and helped create our crash missile program of Atlas—Titan—MM—and Polaris. By 1960 the lead of the Russians in missilery gave us great concern and we faced with real fear a "Missile Gap". Politically massive retaliation had to be abandoned leading eventually to various forms of mutual deterrence. This rapidly eroded confidence in our superiority in science and technology and in its place came doubt and concern.

This concern was deepened in 1959 when the Russians launched the first earth orbiting Satellite "Sputnik" and highlighted our own activities as both inadequate and something of a joke. The country now compounded their fear of a missile gap with concern over loss of prestige and real self doubt. When in 1959 the Russians successfully orbited their first manned spacecraft far in advance of our own Mercury program the country demanded extraordinary action. We wanted to close the missile gap but also wanted to accomplish a major space first to prove to the world and to ourselves that we were number one in science and technology and to restore our prestige in the eyes of the world. We sought for and found a program that would stretch our technical skills and our financial strength to the limit giving us a good chance of accomplishing this mission before the Russians.

As we all know the objective decided upon was project Apollo. Everyone knew that it would take a maximum effort of our technical people as the mission itself was on the fringe of possibilities. It would also require top national priority and a great deal of money. Twenty billion was estimated as its cost over a ten year period. It was also felt that Apollo would require great national resolve to face the probability of some form of disaster in space for a complicated program conducted openly in front of the world.

Apollo was erected not for the purposes of space science—lunar geology or bio engineering but was purely motivated by elements of fear and prestige. The country and the Congress were ready to back this undertaking and did so without stint during the decade.

This demonstrates a fact well known to anyone involved in large development programs. We can do anything we choose if the project can be defined, given top national priority, stability over the period of its development, and adequate funding. Apollo was such a program.

3. THE RESULTS OF APOLLO

I think no one will disagree that Apollo succeeded in its objectives far beyond the

fondest expectation of those who helped create it. Its success has been truly astonishing and it can be said with confidence that the scientific and technical prestige of the country has not only been restored but actually enhanced as the world watched and participated in, through equally astonishing communications, the first lunar landing by Apollo 11. Since that time the world marvelled that Apollo 12 could land next to the unmanned spacecraft surveyor, suffered agonies while Apollo 13 was brilliantly recovered after a major failure of its oxygen tanks, envied Allan Shepard his lunar iron shot during Apollo 14, rode with the crew of Apollo 15 on the lunar rover to Hadley's Rill, watched the crew of Apollo 16 launch itself from the moon through the Rover's TV camera and watched the last Apollo 17 perform an almost flawless mission. Apollo was a magnificent success, a great credit to this country and to the remarkable NASA technical team that accomplished it.

Apollo scientific output was very high and important, but it was a by product of the major objectives. We must keep in mind that Congress didn't appropriate twenty four billion for lunar geophysics. The main motivation came from our early fear and concerns of prestige and self doubt. Apollo then succeeded far beyond anyone's dreams of the early 60s and its success has generated several important reactions. Probably the most important of these was that it apparently drove the Russians out of this type of competition. It is apparent that there was a Russian program for a manned lunar landing but this program was overwhelmed by events (Apollo) and some of their own technical difficulties—they soon gave up this game. This in a sense was too bad as competition with the Russians has always been a major factor in our space program.

We cannot have a two man race if one of the competitors does not want to run. There is still some element of competition with the Russians but it is very small and largely lost as a motivating factor. This is one of NASA's problems today. NASA itself was created in the frightening era of the 1950s on these very motivations and they are having difficulty today in justifying their programs to the Congress along new lines.

The dilemma is that Apollo generated a great competence in the NASA—in space technology—in program management—and in facilities. All of these are now available to the country for whatever undertaking they would like to start. It would be an unacceptable waste to merely throw it all away. The question is can this be used usefully for space programs of interest to the country in the last decades of the twentieth century. It is up to the Administration and to the Congress to more clearly state the mission and rationale for the NASA during the next fifteen years.

4. THE CHANGING FOCUS

In 1965 the Speaker wrote a letter to Mr. Webb then the administrator of NASA suggesting that the motivations that were giving Apollo top national priority and heavy stable funding were indeed fragile ones, and that NASA should concern itself more with the use of space for practical earth oriented purposes. There was considerable question at that time as to Russian intention towards a manned lunar program and many realized that a new major program like Apollo could not be supported in an environment where fear and concern over prestige were eliminated.

NASA had been thinking along the same lines and erected summer studies in 1966/67 to focus attention on the very real payoffs on earth from the use of orbiting spacecraft. Our AIAA president, Dr. Puckett, was an important member of this study and they resulted in the identification of many application potentials.

The most visible were in the various fields of communication, weather monitoring, navigation, mapping, and survey of our natural resources. From that time on NASA has maintained a sophisticated program in space application. NASA has emerged as an innovator of new potentials working with possible users of a new capability and finally providing some operational support. Communications is a good example. NASA did much of the basic work in developing communication satellites and now supports this civilian sector with launch services while pushing out into new areas of communication concepts. There are a multitude of possible space applications which can be developed for the civilian sector but as of today the great launch and payload costs of such systems overwhelms studies of their cost effectiveness.

Space science, another NASA line item, has emerged as a very sophisticated activity with many remarkable successes achieved across a wide spectrum of science. Among the most rewarding have been those programs dealing with astronomy and planetary science. The role of NASA in space science is to help, with the advice of the scientific community, make scientific experiments possible—act as a project integrator—provide launch and readout services—and stimulate new areas. The difficulty with space science is that it continues to be something of a by product of our desire for a national space program. The scientists of the country are not all convinced that space science is the most important science and if given the option would recommend spending this money differently. Space science and exploration then is an inevitable part of a "national space program" undertaken today for no other rationale than this country should spend some of its resources on pushing out space related frontiers. Again many more of these missions would be possible if the very large cost involved in conducting them could be reduced.

5. THE MILITARY

No organization was more rudely shaken by the emergence of practical space operations than the DOD and, in particular, its most explosive service the USAF. Prior to October 1957 space operations for military purposes were ridiculed and any attempt by the military to develop serious space systems was rapidly thrown out as visionary. The Air Force had a surveillance satellite study in progress at the time but it was only funded as a study with no real intent behind it.

After Sputnik the Air Force typically went overboard for space operations and in 1958 at their summer study identified many potentials for space activity across the total front of military operations. This study identified all of those things that we are doing today but also suggested many more that we aren't doing. Many of the things that we aren't doing are those programs for which space adds nothing to a capability except cost. Others aren't being done because the Russians and ourselves have agreed to permit certain activities and not precipitate some form of space warfare.

Man in space was considered at first to be an important military potential and the Air Force was unhappy when their man in space soonest program (MISS) was turned over to the NASA at the time of its activation. The Air Force then embarked on its Winged Reentry program Dynasoar and then to its space station the Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL). Finally all manned military programs were eliminated as no viable military mission was uncovered for man in earth orbit. It was learned finally that the Air Force could not have its major and most expensive R&D line item, a program for which a real mission was not understood. Man in earth orbit has little military payoff as we view it today. There is also severe question as to his use for non-military mis-

sions in earth orbit as well. The NASA Skylab program should help resolve this particular debate.

After the initial euphoria, the USAF and DOD concentrated on real military payoffs, or cost effective if you like that phrase. These areas are surveillance, warning, strategic and tactical communications and navigation. These missions are real and important with space providing a unique capability. There are several more missions that might better be done through the use of space systems if they didn't cost so much.

In today's constrained budget the Armed Services have to give up a front line operational capability to fund such support systems. The system then must be very good indeed to have the Navy give up a new ship or the Air Force give up a new wing of fighters to pay for it. Military space programs then have achieved a solid base of real payoffs. These will inevitably expand further in the years ahead, particularly if the very high cost of space operations can be reduced.

6. SUMMATION

Apollo and all our unmanned programs both in the NASA and the military have been astonishingly successful and through them we have bought and paid for a position of dominance in space activity and in many technologies. We have established great leads in the following technical areas:

1. Solid State devices-integrated circuits-computers.
2. Inertial guidance.
3. Design for high reliability.
4. Operational use of liquid hydrogen as a fuel.
5. Simulation based training.
6. Fuel cells.
7. Systems management and control.

Technological leadership like this is crucial to this country. Our position in world trade requires that we continue to maintain our eminence in areas of high technology. Our National problem is that our young bright minds are turning away from science and technology and if this continues much further we are in for really difficult times. We must excite these young people and convince them that their own interest and the interest of the country are involved in the discovery of new science and the exploitation of new science into new technology. Industry-government-universities must all concentrate on this very real and difficult problems.

Our National Space Program then will be strongly based on real earth oriented payoffs available through space systems. The heart of this will be from both the military and civilian sectors and we can expect these capabilities to grow steadily in the coming years.

Beyond these we have those programs that the country feels that it must do. Not for prestige or fear rationale but because they are the natural goals of a wealthy and progressive society. We must continue to involve ourselves in programs of space science and continue our remarkable activities in space exploration. Perhaps cooperating with the USSR.

At the heart of all this is the potential expansion of these activities through the reduction of the cost of space operation. Today we are impeded across the full spectrum of activities due to extremely high launch costs and the cost of space payloads. The NASA must consider this to be their number one objective in fulfilling their mission of advancing space technology. We feel that we can reduce these costs only by the following possibilities.

- A. Antigravity.
- B. A breakthrough in propulsion.
- C. Recovery and re use of launch systems and payloads.

Of these the only one that might have a payoff for us today is (C) the recovery and re-use of launch systems and payloads. This has

led us inevitably to the NASA shuttle program that does many things for us.

A. Takes full advantage of the NASA capabilities developed through their manned space program.

B. Reduces our complicated stable of rocket launches required for a wide variety of missions.

C. Lowers the cost and increases the flexibility of space operations.

D. Signals our young people that we are not about to throw away our carefully developed technical capability.

E. Can provide the focus for many new technical advances during the next decade.

We are orienting our national space program along new lines and developing new motivations. There is a solid base for our national space program which can be expanded further in many practical ways if we can reduce the cost. The shuttle program can do this and I urge our AIAA membership, the Congress and the Administration to continue their support of this important program.

The country should be proud of our remarkable successes in space activity—it is a thing we have done very well—and we can do much more if the total program is given adequate direction and support.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LOS ANGELES PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend congratulations to the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra, which has recently completed its third tour of Japan, for its contributions to music appreciation and international goodwill. At a time when good relations between the peoples of the world are so important, it is vital that we recognize the ability of the language of music to foster friendship and harmony. The Los Angeles Philharmonic, founded in 1919, has done much to promote this recognition by playing to audiences all over the world.

While in Japan, the director of the Philharmonic, Zubin Mehta, and his musicians, drew the highest praise of the Japanese critics, who were quoted as saying:

The relationship between Mehta and the Philharmonic is that of a truly "matching pair", a fabulous combination. I have the theory that the Philharmonic has become one of the "big five" (American orchestras). This combination has now come to perfection, . . . it has reached the highest pinnacle. (*Asahi Shimbun*)

It was such a fresh surprise to my ear to hear such precision and strength. Mehta's basic attitude was absolutely the right one. In his vocabulary there are no words such as "lukewarm" or "sloppiness." He does not know "halfway," and perhaps this is why he has such popularity here and in America also. (*The Mainichi Shimbun*)

Individuals in solo passages . . . showed as much mastery of the instruments as the different sections of the orchestra. A unison passage . . . can hardly be equaled by any orchestra in the world for its purity and beauty of tone. There is insufficient space to even briefly describe the superiority of the instrumentalists. Mehta can polish a stone to such a high degree that even experts have difficulty deciding whether it is a diamond or a piece of glass. (*Mainichi Daily News*)

Besides their trips to Japan, the philharmonic musicians have also toured the world in 1967—under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of State—performed at Expo '67 in Montreal, and participated in the 25th anniversary ceremonies of the United Nations in 1970 at the invitation of the General Assembly. In addition to these international contributions, the philharmonic plays for millions of people each year in the southern California area. They can be seen at the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion of the Los Angeles Music Center, the Hollywood Bowl, many area college campuses, free in-school concerts, the symphonies for youth series, and at series in Long Beach, Orange County, Pasadena, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Monica. Their efforts to bring the sounds of great music to people all over the world and indeed due the profound respect and admiration of all who share their love for beauty in life.

Some of the many individuals and organizations who have selflessly dedicated themselves to the success of the orchestra are listed below:

**THE MEMBERS OF THE LOS ANGELES
PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA**

Zubin Mehta, Music Director.
Gerhard Samuel, Associate Conductor.

1ST VIOLINS

David Frisina, Concertmaster.
Glenn Dicterow, Associate Concertmaster.
Irving Geller, Assistant Concertmaster.
Glenn Swan, Manuel Newman, Mark Kramer, Lily Mahler, Tze-Koong Wang, Haig Ballan, Charlotte Sax, Richard Leshin, Myrtle Beach, Robert Witte, William Heffernan, Albert Karmazyn, Otis Igelman.

2ND VIOLINS

Harold Dicterow,¹ Jeanne Aiken, Robert Korda, Jack Gootkin, Lori Ulanova, Fred Broders, Janet DeLancey, Roy Tanabe, Barbara Durant, William Rankin, Clarence Schubring, Michael Nutt, Alex Bottero, Carlo Spiga, Olga Balogh.

VIOLAS

Jan Hlinka,¹ Alan de Veritch,² Armand Roth, Albert Falkove, Irving Manning, Arthur Royval, Jerry Epstein, Sidney Fagatt, Susan Winterbottom, George Serulnic, Charles Lorton, Murray Schwartz.

CELLOS

Kurt Reher,¹ Nino Rosso, E. Vance Beach, Edwin Geber, Howard Colf, Jr., Karl Rossner, Phyllis Ross, Wladyslaw Przybyla, Gabriel Jellen, Don Cole, Mary Louise Zeyen, Daniel Rothmuller.

BASSES

Richard Kelley, Sr.,¹ Harold Brown, Elmer Heintzelman, William Torello, Richard D. Kelley, Jr., Frank Granato, Arni Heiderich, Emilio De Palma, Dennis Trembly.

FLUTES

Robert Stevens,² Anne Diener Giles,² Roland Moritz, Miles Zentner.

PICCOLO

Miles Zentner.

OBOES

Bert Gassman,² Barbara Winters,² Donald Muggerridge, William Kosinski.

ENGLISH HORN

William Kosinski.

CLARINETS

Kalman Bloch,² Michele Zukovsky,² Merritt Buxbaum, Franklyn Stokes.

¹ Principal.

² Co-Principal.

³ Associate Principal.

BASS CLARINET
Franklyn Stokes.

E-FLAT CLARINET
Merritt Buxbaum.

BASSOONS
David Breidenthal,² Alan Goodman,² Walter Ritchie, Frederic Dutton.

CONTRABASSOON
Frederic Dutton.

HORNS
Sinclair Lott,² Henry Sigismonti,² Ralph Pyle, George Price, Hyman Markowitz, Robert Watt.

TRUMPETS
Robert Di Vall,² Thomas Stevens,² Irving Bush, Mario Guarnieri.

TROMBONES
Byron Peebles,² H. Dennis Smith,² Herbert Ausman.

BASS TROMBONE
Jeffrey Reynolds.

TUBA
Roger Bobo.

TIMPANI
William Kraft,¹ Mitchell Peters.

PERCUSSION
Walter Goodwin, Charles DeLancey, Mitchell Peters.

HARP
Stanley Chaloupka.

PIANO
Shibley Boyes.

LIBRARIAN
James Dolan.

PERSONNEL MANAGER
Joseph Fishman.

STAGE MANAGER
George Coble.

ADMINISTRATION
Ernest Felschmann, Executive Director.
Jaye Rubanoff, Orchestra Manager.
Jay Helfetz, Promotion Manager.
Orrin Howard, Publications Manager.
Sherryl Slombab, Advertising Manager.
Joan Boyett, Youth Programs Coordinator.
Robert Mathews, Business Manager.
Arthur Dewey, Controller.
Dieter Jacoby, Ticket Manager.
Donald Peterson, Box Office Treasurer.
Carolyn Tollman, Administrative Asst.

THE PERFORMING ARTS COUNCIL OF THE LOS ANGELES MUSIC CENTER

Board of Governors
Mrs. Dorothy Chandler, Chairman.
Albert V. Casey, President.
R. Stanton Avery, Vice President.
Dr. Peter S. Bing, Vice President.
F. Daniel Frost, Vice President.
Charles Starr, Jr., Treasurer.
William H. Patterson, Assistant Treasurer.
Thomas J. McDermott, Jr., Secretary.
John P. Anderson, Assistant Secretary.

Members-At-Large
Mrs. Howard F. Ahmanson.
Mrs. Walter H. Annenberg.
R. Stanton Avery.
Norman Barker, Jr.
MacDonald Becket.
Dr. Peter S. Bing.
F. Patrick Burns.
Albert V. Casey.
Mrs. Dorothy Chandler.
Lawrence E. Deutsch.
Mrs. Leonard Firestone.
F. Daniel Frost.
Philip M. Hawley.
Morton A. Heller.
Mrs. James H. Kindel, Jr.
Joseph B. Koepfl.
Mervyn LeRoy.
Alan W. Livingston.

Thomas J. McDermott, Jr.
Mrs. Ralph M. Parsons.
Mrs. Henry Salvatori.
Charles I. Schneider.
Charles Starr, Jr.
Mrs. Seth Weingarten.
Harry H. Wetzel.
Mrs. Richard H. Wolford.
Dr. Charles E. Young.

THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Peter F. Schabarum, 1st District (chairman).

Kenneth Hahn, 2nd District.
Ernest Debs, 3rd District.
James A. Hayes, 4th District.
Baxter Ward, 5th District.
Arthur G. Will, Chief Administrative Officer.

LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL

John S. Gibson, Jr., President.
Ernest Bernardi.
Thomas Bradley.
Marvin Braude.
Edmund D. Edelman.
John Ferraro.
Gilbert W. Lindsay.
Donald D. Lorenzen.
Billy G. Mills.
Louis R. Nowell.
Mrs. Pat Russell.
Arthur K. Snyder.
Robert J. Stevenson.
Joel Wachs.
Robert M. Wilkinson.

**STATE REGULATION OF NUCLEAR
POWERPLANTS**

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Atomic Energy Act to enable States to impose stricter standards for radioactive emissions than those set by the Atomic Energy Commission. My bill would permit States to regulate these radioactive discharges concurrently with the AEC. An identical bill will be introduced in the Senate by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE.

This legislation is needed because of a 1972 U.S. Supreme Court ruling which struck down the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's regulations governing a nuclear powerplant in Monticello, Minn. The Court said that the Atomic Energy Commission had exclusive jurisdiction in this area. The State of Minnesota, in this case, had the support of the States of Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

My bill would leave the AEC's existing regulatory program intact, but it would enable States like Minnesota to issue tougher regulations if they chose to do so.

In 1959, the Joint Atomic Committee considered the question of transfer of responsibility for control and regulation of byproduct, sources and special nuclear materials from the Commission to the States. Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1959 explicitly recognizes that—

As the States improve their capabilities to regulate effectively such materials, additional legislation may be desirable.

States now control the largest source of radiation exposure to their populations—X-ray machines. Radioactive emissions from atomic machines such as cyclotrons are not under Atomic Energy Commission jurisdiction. State radiological health officers, therefore, already have considerable experience with the subject. Minnesota, by special agreement with the Northern States Power Co., has assumed responsibility for an inplant monitoring program of radioactive emissions which is more extensive than any currently underway by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Many scientists are seriously concerned about the AEC's current regulatory program. This concern stems from a built-in conflict of interest at the AEC. By law, the Commission is charged with the dual responsibility of promoting and regulating atomic energy installations. But promotion and regulation are not always compatible functions.

Twenty-eight nuclear powerplants are now in operation in this country, 52 are being built, and 70 are planned, with reactors on order. During the next few years critical decisions will have to be made about the amount of radioactive wastes these plants will discharge into the air and water of the people living nearby. My bill is designed to recognize the legitimate interests and responsibilities of States in protecting the health, safety, and environment of their citizens.

Support for this measure is widespread in my State. Gov. Wendell R. Anderson, in the letter which follows, points out that the State of Minnesota has led the movement nationwide to allow States to set more restrictive standards than the AEC for nuclear powerplants:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Saint Paul, Minn., January 12, 1973.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE AND CONGRESSMAN FRASER: It is my understanding that you are prepared to introduce in the 93rd Congress a bill to permit the states to regulate the emissions of radioactive effluents from nuclear power plants, including state authority to enforce standards for such radioactive emissions at lesser quantities than provided by the Atomic Energy Commission. I assume this legislation is analogous to the bill you introduced in the last session of Congress.

The State of Minnesota has led the movement nationwide to nullify the current federal pre-emption of the right of state government, so to protect the health and safety of its citizens, to regulate nuclear power plants, including the right to set more restrictive standards than the Atomic Energy Commission. You have our complete support in your efforts to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to accomplish this end. I will communicate my support of this legislation to the other members of the Minnesota Congressional delegation.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WENDELL R. ANDERSON.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency—MPCA—at its recent monthly

meeting passed a resolution endorsing this bill. In the following letter, MPCA Director Grant J. Merritt calls attention to the fact that States already have the right to set stricter standards for non-radioactive water and air pollutants:

MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 11, 1973.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: I am pleased to learn that you intend to re-introduce the bill amending the Atomic Energy Act to permit states to set stricter regulations for radioactive emissions than those of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Many Minnesotans have long believed that Minnesota has both the right and the duty to set stricter standards than the AEC. Therefore, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency set such standards to govern the Monticello Nuclear Plant. A court suit followed and last April the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a lower court ruling that Congress had preempted the field and placed regulatory authority over radioactive emissions exclusively with the federal government. I hope that Congress will soon act to return this traditional right to the states so that they will have the ability to act in the best interest of their citizens in this matter.

As you know, states have the right to set stricter standards for non-radioactive water and air pollutants. Extending this right to radioactive emissions would place regulation in the hands of competent local authorities, who are responsive to the need for protection.

At its recent monthly meeting, the MPCA passed the enclosed resolution on the matter.

We need and want the legislation you propose and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Board and I heartily extend our support and endorsement of your efforts and of the efforts of your co-sponsors.

Sincerely yours,

GRANT J. MERRITT,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION II: PASSED BY THE MPCA BOARD,
JANUARY 8, 1973

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Board supports the response of Congressmen Fraser, Quie and Karth and Senators Mondale and Humphrey to our request to introduce legislation allowing the states to regulate, concurrently with the Atomic Energy Commission, radioactive emissions from nuclear power plants. That legislation, (HR 17120 and S 4093 in the last congress—new numbers not yet available in this congress), will accomplish our goal of allowing concurrent regulation.

We respectfully request that the Minnesota Legislature send a memorial to congress affirming our position and adding its support to this legislation.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2314

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit the States concurrently with the Atomic Energy Commission to regulate the emission of radioactive effluents

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the control of the several States of the emission of radioactive effluents from facilities regulated by the Atomic Energy Commission is compatible with the development of atomic energy and its regulation on a national scale;

(2) current law does not sufficiently enable the several States to regulate such radioactive emissions in order to protect the public health and safety; and

(3) it is the intent of this Act to establish the concurrent authority of the several States to regulate such radioactive emissions, including the authority to enforce standards for such radioactive emissions, which permit lesser quantities of such emissions from such facilities than do the standards established by the Commission.

SEC. 2. Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (6) of subsection a. and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) to give full recognition to the legitimate interest and responsibility of each State in matters pertaining to the public health and safety;"

(2) by striking out "No agreement" in subsection c. and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to subsection o., no agreement"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"o. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent any State from regulating concurrently with the Commission the discharge or disposal of radioactive effluents from the site of a utilization or production facility in such State, if—

"(1) the requirements or standards imposed by such State are for the protection of the public health and safety, and

"(2) action permitted or tolerated by such State with respect to the discharge or disposal of such effluents is not specifically prohibited by the Commission."

CONGRESS AND SPENDING

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there is much ferment now for restoring to the Congress authority which has been assumed by the President and the executive branch of Government. I certainly hope the Congress will take advantage of the current mood and restore itself to the position as a genuinely equal partner with the executive branch of Government.

It is undoubtedly a natural human tendency for persons to seek power. This is true in both the legislative and executive branches. During my service in the Congress, I have seen power flow from the Congress to the President. I do not agree with many Presidential critics who claim that he has usurped power. I believe the Congress is equally at fault for either giving him authority outright or for acquiescing in the transfer of legislative authority to the executive.

It is very easy for Congress to let the President decide the thorny issues which necessitates a transfer of authority by default. I have seen a number of Presidents come and go and I recall the efforts of a former President to reverse the legislative roles of our two branches by giving the President and his cabinet authority to establish new programs without legislative mandate while giving the Congress the power to veto them if it disagreed with the new programs within 60 days after their announcement. Fortunately, the Congress did not give the President this authority at that time.

One of the controversies generating

the most publicity at the present time is the President's efforts to curb Federal spending to \$250 billion. He has made cuts almost all across the board in trying to stay within this spending limitation. The debate in the House of Representatives on the need for such a spending limitation when it was discussed as an amendment to the legislation extending the debt ceiling clearly shows that economic conditions require such thrift.

If the Congress is to restore its authority, it must accept the responsibility for establishing an overall spending ceiling early in its deliberations on the President's proposed budget for coming fiscal years. I believe a procedure must be devised to balance revenues against expenditures on a unified basis looking at the total picture.

At the present time, the House takes up a small part of the budget and considers only that segment without reference to the entire budget. The piecemeal process usually takes several months, extending into the fiscal year for which we are appropriating funds. The total budget appropriation is not known until the last appropriation bill is signed into law.

It seems to me the logical approach would be to review the total budget, look at the national economic conditions, examine the problems facing the Nation, determine congressional priorities showing the will of the people, establish an overall ceiling dependent upon economic conditions and national problems and then fit the programs into the overall ceiling.

Emergencies may arise so that the ceiling adopted early in a session of the Congress must be breached, but I believe that the ceiling should be broken only by a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives.

At the same time the overall ceiling is established, anticipated revenues should be determined. The Congress should then decide whether taxes should be increased to balance a budget or make a conscious decision to increase the public debt by a specific amount.

Once these two decisions have been made, I believe it is incumbent upon any Member who proposes new expenditures to also propose the necessary taxation to pay for the program or decrease expenditures elsewhere.

COMMITTEE REPORT ON SOUTH-EAST ASIAN HEROIN

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1973, the Committee on Foreign Affairs released a report entitled "The U.S. Heroin Problem and Southeast Asia" which was compiled by two members of the committee staff.

While the report does not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the committee, the information presented

therein should be of interest to all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I would like to insert a synopsis of the report which contains a summary of the committee's activities regarding international trafficking in illicit drugs and a listing of the staff survey team's conclusions and recommendations:

THE U.S. HEROIN PROBLEM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(A synopsis of a staff report)

BACKGROUND

1. On July 8, 1971, the Committee on Foreign Affairs amended the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by adding a section entitled International Narcotics Control (see section 481 of the Act). The amendment, offered by Congressman John Monagan during markup of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, gave the President authority to furnish economic assistance to countries that cooperate with the United States in controlling the production of, and traffic in, narcotics and psychotropic drugs. The amendment also directed the President to discontinue economic and military assistance and sales under the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and Public Law 480 to any country not cooperating with the United States in coping with the narcotics problem.

2. \$20,617,000 was provided in fiscal year 1972 pursuant to the authorization contained in section 481. For fiscal year 1973, the Executive branch has programmed \$42.5 million for narcotics control assistance programs.

3. In addition to hearings held by the Subcommittee on Europe in July 1971, there have also been a number of study missions conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs relating to the international aspects of the narcotics problem:

(a) During April 3-23, 1971, Congressmen Morgan F. Murphy and Robert H. Steele made a round-the-world study of the problem. Their report, "The World Heroin Problem," articulated the dimensions of the worldwide narcotics problem and helped to create an awareness in the Congress that legislation was needed to deal with illegal international traffic in narcotics.

(b) During the same period, Congressman Seymour Halpern made a separate study of the international narcotics problem. He submitted a report entitled "The International Narcotics Trade and Its Relation to the United States," which also aided the Committee in its deliberations on legislation involving international narcotics control.

(c) In August 1972, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs directed John J. Brady and Robert K. Boyer, Committee Staff Consultants, to go to Southeast Asia to conduct an in-depth survey of that area's production of and trafficking in narcotics, and the related effect of such operations on the United States. The survey team conducted its investigation in Tokyo, Japan, Hong Kong, Saigon, Laos, Thailand, and Rangoon, Burma, between August 16, 1972, and September 3, 1972. Prior to their departure and upon their return, the survey team held extensive consultations with Executive branch officials representing every department or agency involved in the U.S. effort to control the flow of narcotics in this country.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the survey team follow.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, which is responsible for the formulation and coordination of all policies and programs relating to the fight against the illegal entry of narcotics into the U.S., is both inefficient and ineffective. Comprised of autonomous departments, bu-

reaus, and agencies of the Federal Government, the Committee conducts its business on a person-to-person level rather than institutionally. U.S. anti-narcotics programs, therefore, are often formulated in an ad hoc fashion rather than upon a well conceived, well thought out, well coordinated manner. As a result the following questionable decisions and programs have emerged.

(a) Yet another intelligence group, the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence (ONNI) has been formed in spite of the fact that the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs' Office of Strategic Intelligence (OSI) was already in existence and possessed the necessary intelligence capabilities which must be developed by the new group before it can operate at all.

(b) 25 Customs agents have been sent overseas to collect narcotics intelligence. This program will result in a duplication of effort. The Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD), the Department of State, and other U.S. Government agencies are already collecting such intelligence. The problem in the past was not a lack of intelligence but an inability to exploit it properly.

(c) BNDD and Customs agents in foreign posts are involved in intelligence collection efforts although many of them do not speak the language of the country in which they operate.

(d) The decision to make a preemptive purchase of opium from the Chinese Irregular forces in Northern Thailand set a bad precedent which could encourage increased production in the Golden Triangle.

2. In Southeast Asia, where the bulk of the world's illicit opiates are produced, all U.S. mission components have been mobilized in the fight to suppress the narcotics traffic. Coordination both within the missions and between the missions and most host governments has improved over the past several months. There is no evidence that any U.S. Government agency is implicated in the narcotics traffic in Southeast Asia.

3. The use of opium has been accepted and tolerated in many Southeast Asian countries. These attitudes are beginning to change as a result of the increasing use of heroin among the area's youth and there is a growing willingness to cooperate with the United States and the U.N. in international efforts to control the production of and trafficking in opiates.

4. Under present circumstances, however, the elimination of opium and heroin production in the Golden Triangle is not possible. Even if the efforts of Laos and Thailand to control the production of and trafficking in opium and its derivatives, morphine and heroin, are completely successful, which is unlikely, the problem cannot possibly be solved as long as the Government of Burma fails to declare war on producers and traffickers in Burma.

5. The Burmese Government blames the United States for a large part of the illicit arms trafficking in Southeast Asia, claiming that much of the weaponry in the possession of the insurgents is of U.S. origin. This situation has had a negative effect upon U.S. efforts to gain Burmese cooperation in the narcotics suppression programs.

6. Suppression efforts have been temporarily successful in Northern Thailand. While there is no assurance that this situation will continue there are indications that alternate smuggling routes are being developed westward through Burma, Bangladesh, and in other directions.

7. While efforts have been made by the Thai Government to resettle Chinese Irregular Forces who have been traditionally involved in the opium trade, there is no assurance that they will not continue to engage in the production of and trafficking in opiates.

8. It is widely believed that the production of and trafficking in opium and its derivatives have had the support of high ranking government officials in Laos, especially General Ouan Rathikoun, former Chief of the Imperial General Staff and presently serving in the National Assembly as a delegate from Luang Prabang. The extent of Ouan's involvement may never be known.

9. Despite the stringent antidrug law recently passed by South Vietnam, individuals involved in narcotics traffic risk minimal punishment.

10. Given the current situation, there is a limit to the amount of financial and material assistance that the countries of Southeast Asia can usefully absorb. U.S. narcotics assistance programs should, therefore, be based upon a realistic assessment of what can be effectively utilized.

11. Acetic anhydride is an essential element in the production of heroin. The bulk of this chemical used in Southeast Asia heroin laboratories is processed in Japan. There are no government restrictions, controls, or monitoring of its export.

12. Efforts to fight the illicit production and trafficking of narcotics in Southeast Asia will require regional programs, regional co-operation, and a complete and frank exchange of intelligence on producers, financiers, traffickers, routes, and users. Intergovernmental cooperation in the Southeast Asia region, which has been slow in developing must be vigorously pushed by the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, in its present form, be abolished.

(a) In its place, an International Narcotics Control Board should be established which would be headed by a White House based official appointed by the President.

(b) The head of the Board, which would be a full-time job, should be authorized to preside over the formulation of policies and programs relating to international narcotics control.

2. The Office of National Narcotics Intelligence be transferred to BNDD and integrated with that Bureau's Office of Strategic Intelligence.

3. Only personnel who speak the language of the country in which they operate be assigned to intelligence collection duties abroad.

4. Congress authorize and appropriate international narcotics control assistance funds on a line item basis to insure that funding requests do not become excessive.

5. Steps be taken to preclude interagency competition for international narcotics control assistance funds. These funds should be expended on programs which will have the greatest impact whether such program originate in the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs or AID.

6. Congress require periodic reports from the Executive branch showing the amount of assistance furnished to each country including the type, quality, and value of equipment furnished. This report should also contain data giving amounts spent by all agencies of the Federal Government on international narcotics control programs including personnel salaries, allowances, and U.S. overhead costs.

7. The United States enforce the provisions of section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and insure that all countries receiving U.S. military assistance provide the same degree of security protection afforded such articles by the United States.

8. The United States continue to apply diplomatic and economic pressures at the highest levels of government in Southeast Asia to insure that there is no weakening of the narcotics suppression efforts which have

been started, particularly in Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam.

(a) Where conclusive evidence shows high ranking or influential figures to be involved in narcotics, the U.S. Government should strongly urge those governments to prosecute such individuals more vigorously than has been the case in the past.

(b) If these efforts are unsuccessful, the United States should terminate all economic and military assistance to that country.

9. Crop substitution programs be developed as expeditiously as possible.

10. The United States conduct an intensive campaign both bilaterally and multilaterally to encourage the Government of Burma to cooperate fully in the antinarcotics effort in Southeast Asia.

11. The U.S. Government request the Japanese Government to establish controls and restrictions on the export of acetic anhydride.

12. The United States initiate efforts to gain the cooperation of Bangladesh in the worldwide effort to control the smuggling of narcotics.

13. If U.S. officials in Hong Kong are not able to impress upon British authorities the importance of, and the need for, cooperation in the antinarcotics effort, then the Department of State should bring this matter to the attention of Her Majesty's Government in London.

14. The United States make a concerted effort in the United Nations to promote increased funding and support for the U.N. Drug Abuse Control Fund.

NEEDED: MEANINGFUL PRISON REFORM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, American prisons have, in many respects, been failing in their task of, on the one hand, punishing serious offenders and removing them from the society at large and, on the other, of rehabilitating minor offenders so that they might be returned to the society to lead productive and meaningful lives.

We have tended to place juveniles and first offenders convicted of nonviolent crime in the same prisons with hardened criminals. The result is that such prisons become preparatory schools for teaching and learning violent and antisocial behavior. Men are returned from prisons to society not only lacking rehabilitation, but committed more than ever to lives of crime.

Unfortunately, much of the discussion of penal reform has led to two alternatively simplistic approaches. These were described by Winston E. Moore, executive director of Chicago's Cook County Department of Corrections, in these terms:

Many turn to the kid-glove approach of appeasement programs, destined to keep the lid on the correctional pressure cooker, without any true rehabilitative value. On the other extreme, punitive jailers believe that putting the "fear of God" into inmates is a sure way of keeping prison riots and disorders in check.

Mr. Moore, who previously served as superintendent of the Cook County jail, points out that—

Prison sentences are becoming shorter and shorter. Judges are increasingly reluctant to hand down long-term sentences, except in cases involving the most heinous crimes. Even in such cases, parole boards have not hesitated to send the criminal back into society after only a minimum time is served. This means correctional institutions do not have a great deal of time in which to do their rehabilitative work.

In 1970, under Mr. Moore's leadership, the PACE—programed activities for correctional education—was started as a pilot program in Chicago. It now offers general equivalency diplomas for the completion of elementary and secondary study, and certificates of hourly accomplishment in vocational training.

Mr. Moore points out that—

Prior to the program the recidivist (returnee) rate of our sentenced inmates was nearly 70 per cent. Now the recidivist rate of those inmates enrolled in PACE courses is less than 15 per cent.

Also essential in any program of prison reform, he believes, is the "weeding out of those unfit for correctional staffs, while preventing the hiring of new misfits."

Winston Moore is not interested in new bureaucracies or in utopian panaceas concerning prisons and crime. He is interested in realistic programs which make things better, and not worse.

He has set forth some of ideas in an article entitled "A Human Approach to Prison Reform." This article appears in the November 1972 issue of TWA Ambassador magazine. I wish to share it with my colleagues, and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

A HUMAN APPROACH TO PRISON REFORM

(By Winston E. Moore)

The rising crime rate in the United States will never be solved until we improve our penal systems, which presently are characterized by turmoil, brutality, neglect, racism and indifference to human suffering.

The reasoning is simple and often stated: The prisons and jails of the nation are but prep schools, basic training for a life of crime.

As bewildered correctional administrators desperately look for easy solutions to save their institutions from the nightmare of inmate riots, many turn to the kidglove approach of appeasement programs, destined to keep the lid on the correctional pressure cooker without any true rehabilitative value.

On the other extreme, punitive jailers believe that putting "the fear of God" into inmates is a sure way of keeping prison riots and disorders in check.

For instance, some prison officials, despite last year's Attica tragedy, have returned to hard line defense procedures by making it mandatory for all guards to carry three-foot riot batons, better known among guards as "nigger sticks." Of course, neither of the two extreme approaches to corrections is effective in dealing with the crisis in the nation's prisons.

The fate of corrections rests squarely on the shoulders of correctional administrators and on the municipal, state and federal courts that oversee correctional institutions, procedures. They must work in accord to bring about needed change.

There is a notable absence of relevant dialogue within the profession regarding the possible enactment of long-term rehabilitative programs for correctional institutions. Discussion has been limited largely to examining "easy methods" of dealing with the troublesome inmates, and to drawing up plans for mass construction of small "community-based" institutions—to be built in "inner-

cities" (meaning black ghettos) for the purpose of ridding white administrators of allegedly incorrigible militant black and Spanish-speaking inmates. The thinking behind the construction of such "community-based" facilities is that black and Latin inmates are "different" from white inmates and thus require different, more specialized handling than is possible in large, integrated institutions.

A professional preoccupation with "community-based" facilities' physical plants has resulted in neglect of procedures for selection of intelligent, experienced and concerned administrators. The designers seem preoccupied with building new human storage warehouses without regard to programs and administration.

This gross lack of concern for the human factor in corrections on the part of planners is largely responsible for the sorry state in which corrections finds itself.

The solution for corrections' dilemma certainly does not lie in "instant programs" or in costly and racially discriminatory redistribution of jail and prison populations. We need a new, tightly knit, professional organization made up solely of progressive dedicated and committed heads of jails and prisons. Such an organization should, as its major task, draft and implement long-range master plans for the uniform servicing of all inmates in the United States. Uniform standards of procedures are needed in education, vocational training, recreation, architectural designs of institutions and for medical, psychological and psychiatric care.

Prison sentences are becoming shorter and shorter. Judges are increasingly reluctant to hand down long-term sentences, except in cases involving the most heinous of crimes. Even in such cases, parole boards have not hesitated to send the criminal back into society after only a minimum time is served. This means correctional institutions do not have a great deal of time in which to do their rehabilitative work.

I contend that rehabilitative work—i.e., an intensive effort to change the criminal behavior of the inmate—must begin the minute the inmate arrives. Unfortunately, most correctional efforts currently are only directed toward the long-term prisoner who is vastly outnumbered by his short-term counterpart.

Consequently, the bulk of our jail and prison inmates are condemned to a period of idleness and boredom. They often become either the victims or perpetrators of inmate crimes and, as a result, become more alienated—not only from the law, but especially from the correctional system that keeps them confined. When their time has been served, they are turned loose on society as individuals whose attitudes in general are hostile and bitter. Such alienation invariably leads to new criminal involvement, frequently more intense and more vicious than the original crime.

Are rehabilitative efforts directed at short-term inmates a waste of time? We have dramatic evidence to the contrary.

The PACE (Programmed Activities for Correctional Education) Institute method presently constitutes my department's basic education and vocational training program. Through it, we demonstrate at Cook County that we can work effectively with inmates, whether they are sentenced to six days, six weeks, six months or six years. We don't need to have a man for 10 years to rehabilitate him.

PACE began as a pilot program in 1970 for a small number of our sentenced population. It now offers General Equivalency Diplomas (GED) for completion of elementary and secondary study, and certificates of hourly accomplishment in vocational training. Last June, we began to expand PACE for 100 per cent participation of all our sentenced inmates.

Prior to the program, the recidivist (returnee) rate of our sentenced inmates was nearly 70 per cent. Now the recidivist rate of those inmates enrolled in PACE courses is less than 15 per cent.

Yet, in the final analysis, even the finest program depends for its success on the caliber of the jail and prison staff.

The surest route to failure is the present haphazard recruitment of correctional personnel, characterized by a seemingly uncanny knack for selecting the inept, emotionally unstable, unintelligent, brutal and racist.

Too many persons are hired who have a conscious or unconscious need to control other people, or who have a personal ax to grind. These people are incapable of distinguishing between an individual's offense and the individual himself. In other words, they see only murderers, rapists and armed robbers, not human beings needing alternate avenues away from crime.

The key to meaningful reforms is the development of testing methods capable of weeding out those unfit for correctional staffs, while preventing the hiring of new misfits.

I sharply disagree with those who contend that the upgrading of jail and prison staffs can be accomplished simply by increasing salaries. Although an uncompromising advocate of adequate pay for prison and jail staffs, I also am acutely aware of the massive failure of higher salaries in bringing about an improvement in our police forces. Most police salaries have nearly doubled since 1960, but the quality of our cities' "finest" has remained alarmingly low—and in some cases it has even decreased.

We end up paying "our men in blue" more for doing a worse job.

I take particular issue with those individuals who are encouraging the indiscriminate appropriations of federal grants in the name of correctional reforms. We have just witnessed the spectacular failure of Office of Economic Opportunity funds to come to grips with the problem of poverty, and I predict a similar failure of federal grants in corrections if we refuse to learn from experience.

Let us create another vast and wasteful bureaucratic apparatus in corrections, we must devise stringent guidelines to assure that federal funds will be applied to the improvement of prison conditions and prison programs rather than being squandered on bureaucrats. If we fail, taxpayer money at best will wind up in the hands of well-meaning, inept do-gooders or, at worst, in the pockets of slick, high-salaried administrators whose only interest in corrections is their monthly paycheck.

Either way, we will have come no closer toward dealing with the crisis in corrections, but dangerously near the point when our jails and prisons will become the breeding places for anarchy—not only within the prison walls but in society at large.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE KALITERNA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was, indeed, Oregon's loss and San Pedro's gain, when, in 1928, Rose Kaliterna came to California to make her home. And now, for the many years of service to the community, her fellow citizens are paying homage to her on February 1, as the honoree of the San Pedro Lion's Sixth Annual Recognition Banquet.

This honor is a result of the dedicated, devoted community activity that has earned her the love and respect of all who know her.

Married for over 40 years to Vincent Kaliterna, a retired foreman for Starkist Foods, Mrs. Kaliterna has been active in civic, philanthropic, and club work in San Pedro since the late 1920's.

Since 1953, a charter member of the Peninsula Volunteers of the Needlework Guild of America, Rose is section president of that organization. Each year she has been responsible for collecting several hundred new garments and cash from San Pedro organizations in order to establish a "shoe fund." In October of each year, the garments and the cash are consolidated and distributed to those in need in the harbor area. As a result of this activity and the "Christmas for the needy" program on Christmas Day at the Ports 'O Call Restaurant, the less fortunate families of the area can enjoy the holiday season with new clothes and can provide a real Christmas for their children.

In addition to this work for the betterment of all in the community, Rose, for the past 5 years, has been responsible for supervising and helping to address 1,500 envelopes for the Foundation for the Junior Blind.

Mrs. Kaliterna, often referred to as "Mrs. San Pedro," has been President of the Women's Division of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce for four terms, and has held practically every other executive office since becoming a charter member of that civic organization. In addition, she has served as a director on the board of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce for several years.

For over 25 years, she has been a member of the San Pedro Coordinating Council. During this period, Rose has served in various capacities as an officer and chairman.

To bring top performing artists to San Pedro each year, Mrs. Kaliterna has been a key member of the San Pedro Community Concert Association, and today, she serves as the membership chairman of that organization.

She has been on the board of YWCA and has chaired various committees in this organization for a number of years. In addition, Mrs. Kaliterna has served on the board committee formed to select the name of Dodson Junior High School.

In order to establish and maintain recreational activities for the people of San Pedro, Rose serves on the longstanding committee to organize and plan the Peck Estate Fund.

As president for 20 terms of the Yugoslav Women's Club, Rose Kaliterna has helped promote fellowship and coordination with the many leading civic organizations in San Pedro.

She is an active member of the San Pedro Community Development Advisory Committee, and the San Pedro Claretian Guild.

In addition, Mrs. Kaliterna is a leader of the Town and Country Catholic Women's Club, an activity in which she has held all executive offices. This outstanding organization helps serve the Catholic maritime luncheon which is held each

month at the Mary Star of the Sea Auditorium.

A volunteer "yellow bird" at the San Pedro and Peninsula Hospital for several years, Rose Kaliterna, in 1971, received the Honorary Service Award from the Lomita-San Pedro PTA in recognition of her many years of volunteer service in the harbor area.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to Mrs. Rose Kaliterna for her dedicated service to the people of the harbor area, and to call to the attention of the Congress, her years of active participation in building the community spirit that has made San Pedro such a vibrant area.

The selfless devotion of Mrs. Rose Kaliterna, and citizens like her, have created our country and represents the spirit of America and her people.

I would also like to mention the members of her family who have consistently given Rose the encouragement and support so vital to the continuation of her years of sacrifice and toil in behalf of the community. Of course, I have mentioned her husband, Vincent, who has given his unflagging support. Mrs. Kaliterna also has received the encouragement of her two sisters, Mrs. Margaret Rush and Mrs. Paul Bakotich, and her brother, Mr. John B. Avian. She is also the proud aunt and great-aunt of several nieces, nephews, grandnieces, and grandnephews who live in San Pedro.

WHY SOME SAY CHILDREN SHAN'T PRAY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1972, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by my friend "Bill" W. H. M. Stover, for 17 years until 1962 sponsor of the Dale Carnegie courses in the Nation's Capital and nearby Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland. The article was entitled "Why Can't They Pray."

Mr. Stover has now written a sequel to that article, "Why Some Say Children Shan't Pray," which I believe will be of interest to all who read the RECORD. I, therefore, insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WHY SOME SAY CHILDREN SHAN'T PRAY

Not everyone who opposes a prayer amendment, or any form of corrective legislation to restore the right to pray, or not to pray and/or to read the Bible in public schools is necessarily sinister, or evil, or anti-God.

This is a fact which some are prone to forget. So let us admit that all persons holding such views are not devils. Some are merely confused. Many are apathetic. Some are non-thinkers who depend on others for leadership, often unwisely. And unfortunately, some are just narrow-minded, or prejudiced, or both. These often reflect an inheritance of old concepts, long outdated. But, some have honest misgivings.

Many are prone to take their cue from crusading clergy or professional Church Council employees, who often display more of politics than religion. Others merely re-

flect the favored political viewpoint of the moment. And still others don't want to become involved—especially not in anything of a religious nature.

However, sad to say, it is this group of misguided, God fearing people, who have frustrated and defeated every effort made thus far to restore to little children their inherent right to pray, or not to pray and/or to read the Holy Bible in school. With such religious friends the prayer cause needs few other enemies.

Intelligent, religious people are not too seriously concerned over the opposition of atheists, infidels, criminals, or other hell-raisers—even Communists. The world has come to expect them to oppose anything that is right. With the united efforts of the good people in America we can easily deal with those elements that attack from without. But, what really hurts our cause is to have termite, no matter how nobly motivated, constantly boring from within.

Apathy is at the root of much of our lack of support. Many good people believe—but—but, they say, We agree—but—but. They explain it is un-Christian to become involved in any religious controversy.

So, they sit supinely on their—buts while more loquacious and less inhibited crusaders take over. Often they belong to that large captive audience, who Sunday after Sunday get brain-washed with the prejudiced views of the speaker who only too often sings the political concepts to some Church Council tune.

Non-thinkers pose a real problem. Some of the reasons given for opposing, by otherwise intelligent individuals of position, are so preposterous and ridiculously asinine as to be almost unbelievable. Some of these are later discussed.

If you are a religious person—and after ten years of endless confusion—do not favor any effort to restore prayer and the Bible to public schools, why not? Subject your answer to the test of logic. Have you just accepted unchallenged, the view expressed by someone you respect? He could be wrong, you know. Or, have you accepted some nebulous written opinion, without proper reflection? Now is the time to reassess your position, and, hopefully, to change.

Here are some positions taken against, by important public figures. Some in arrogance. Some by unfortunate prejudice. Some have just fallen prey to foolish, wishful thinking. Enough details are being documented here so that any may check and know the accuracy of any statement.

Here is an example of arrogance personified. The Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee held hundreds of amendments and other prayer legislation bottled up in his committee for years. Finally, the Wylie Amendment signed by over 200 disgusted Members of the House and by discharge petition was forced to the floor for vote. And, it is claimed, that one of his staff members, on the payroll of another opposed congressman, fought the measure behind the scenes lobbying against it—unlawfully.

Furthermore, the Chairman was so biased that he was repeatedly accused of freely admitting opposition testimony and burying favorable testimony in his files. That happened to by own 5 pages of testimony entitled, "A Dozen Fuzzy Fallacies About the Becker Amendment," submitted on 5/24/64.

On 6/8/64 the Chairman wrote me saying, "I am anxious that the record of hearings be not unduly voluminous . . . Your letter and attachments have been placed in the file." Incidentally, that veteran Congressman was retired by his own Democratic party in the '72 primaries.

Here is one case of reported bigotry. A Republican Protestant Member of the House bragged that he led his party forces in opposition to the Wylie Amendment. But to a crony who talked he is said to have confided

that his real opposition was his fear of Catholicism. If true which knowing the man I doubt, this would be prejudice and bigotry at its worst and wholly unwarranted.

Such a theory, is non-religious nonsense. It is suggested that religious prejudice seldom springs from religion, but rather from a lack of religion. Incidentally, this Member too, was retired by the voters in the November '72 election.

Wishful thinking is one of the most insidiously dangerous reasons causing opposition. One friend, a fine Christian Congressman, for years spoke in favor of corrective legislation. Then suddenly he switched and voted against the Wylie Amendment.

Asked for his reason for the switch, he said, "Every school that I visited this year had prayer and Bible reading at the opening exercises. So, I've concluded that no legislation is necessary." What he unwittingly was saying was, that schools he visited have not yet been caught bootlegging religion and stopped by Court action—as has N.Y., Pa. and Md.

One leader in the Senate frankly admits that he led the opposition to the amendment sponsored so seriously by the late Senator Everett Dirksen. He is a distinguished churchman and jurist, with a long record of commendable public service, in the Senate and elsewhere.

Yet in 1966 he said, "I don't believe the Supreme Court decision on prayer should be reversed." Asked why? he gives these reasons:

(1) "The First Amendment to the Constitution was written . . . to establish a wall of separation of church and state." Here we are right back again to that chestnut. The question arises, Is it concern for the Constitution? Or, could it be that long-standing druthers have a bearing?

(2) My next question of the Senator is, Isn't a Constitutional Amendment the very correction process provided in that document itself? And wasn't provision made therein for this very kind of change, whereby the people thru the democratic process might effect needed change?

(3) Then the Senator theorized that, "A Constitutional Amendment . . . will likely result in compulsory praying." But, why should it? Can anyone seriously conceive of compulsory prayer? We can't even compel hoodlums to obey the laws of the land—nor even the little children. Does anyone know of any case of compulsory prayer PRIOR to the 1962 Court booby?

(4) The Senator further says, "I don't believe the Court prayer decision . . . prohibits voluntary prayer on an (individual) basis. This (right) already exists." Why all the emphasis on Voluntary and Individual Rights? Surely the good Senator doesn't mean to say that group school prayer should be outlawed? Or, does he? Do you think it should? Or, the Bible be barred from classroom reading? Think about that a bit. If the Senator believed that in 1966 at the time he spoke, does he still hold that view today? I doubt it seriously and hopefully, for his is a strong voice in the Senate and America.

(5) Furthermore, many would not at all agree that the Court decision doesn't prohibit . . . prayers." Of course, the Court didn't say in so many words, thou shall not pray. But the result is the same.

Prayer and the Bible, in schools all across America, as the Senator well knows, either have already been excluded, else are in the process of being excluded—either directly—or indirectly as a by-product of the Court's unfortunate, erroneous decisions of 1962 and since. Certainly they have been excluded in N.Y., Pa. and Md.

Now with the approach of the 1972 Christmas season, in nearby Prince Georges County of Maryland the school superintendent has ruled out religious Yule music for all school exercises. Even the Messiah, a Handel oratorio has been barred from Christmas school

programs. What further doubt can an intelligent person now have of the need for corrective legislation? (6) At my recent request the Senator kindly sent me a copy of his Senate speech of 8/7/66, with 23 pages of documentation which had been extended into the Congressional Record. In this material was quoted a 130 year old article, advocating a concept which surely the Senator in his wisdom, would not today condone.

The article endorsed more recently by a well known columnist reasoned that, "Disturbing an issue that has been laid to rest for 3 years" was somehow wrong. And the late Senator Dirksen was being chided for "not leaving well enough alone."

Both the columnist and the Senator failed to tell us how they could rationalize this view with the 1962 action taken by 5 of 9 Members of the Supreme Court, in which a wholly new and radical re-interpretation was made on prayer—after a case had been laid to rest for more than a century and a half—without doing violence to the First Amendment or church-state separatism. Nor did either site any case where anyone in those 150 years and ever been compelled to pray—in school.

(7) In another documentation used as authority, the statement is made that "The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects and place them beyond the reach of majorities . . . and establish . . . freedom of worship . . . and other fundamental rights" . . . (which) "may not be submitted to vote: They depend on the outcome of no elections."

What is being said here is that, a few men, years ago, set down an infallible document—in the Bill of Rights, which may not be questioned, amended, or changed. Even if a majority of 80% of the people wish a change made, the document must stand forever, as written, and interpreted—or re-interpreted by 5 of 9 misguided men—as was done in 1962. Do you accept that concept? Frankly, I do not.

Then the Senator closed his speech saying, "I close with the prayer that the Senate will do exactly that and no more." In other words the prayer issue, under this ill logic, is beyond the reach of 80% of the voters—because the voting people are too dumb to be entrusted with their Constitutional right to determine under what conditions their children shall be educated. Voters challenge and resent this.

These apparently were Senator Sam Ervin's views in 1966. In light of more recent developments, he has no doubt, made many reassessments. He is a man of unquestioned integrity who would not—and I predict—will not hesitate to change, once convinced he has been mistaken. Looking toward 1974 it might very well be proper that he reassess his stance on the prayer and Bible issue. Should he change, we would welcome his support.

Following defeat of the Wylie Amendment, one Congressman asked, "Why were the chief executioners of school prayer the very men who claim to speak for the churches of America?" He said, "This amendment was scuttled by an hysterical lobbying campaign of church groups. They put on one of the best orchestrated lobby jobs I've ever seen."

Said another, "They have become so concerned with secular and political goals as to forget the purpose for which they are supposed to exist—to acknowledge and serve God."

Said one Catholic Congressman, "A 5 man executive committee testified against the Amendment, presuming to speak for 300 Bishops and the entire Catholic Church in the U.S., whose views were not even sought out in advance."

And when 2 Protestant clergymen took a position against—(One a staff member from the Nat'l. Council of Churches—the other on

the staff of the American Baptist Convention) they testified against the Becker Amendment, falsely claiming to represent 40 million Protestants. Here again, no prior poll had ever been taken of either clergy or church members.

Furthermore, if the testimony of Mon-signor Fulton J. Sheen and Dr. Billy Graham, each speaking for himself only, was correct that 85% of the people wanted prayer restored to the classroom, then the 2 Protestant Reverends misrepresented 34 million Protestants in their testimony.

Aside from the legitimate concern to preserve state-church separation and do no violence to the First Amendment, there are 3 bits of phony flack that needs to be watched and rated on its merits—or lack.

(1) First, not all high sounding organizations with such names in their titles are necessarily legitimate. These terms often are used as a smoke screen by atheists, infidels and fellow-travelers operating either as individuals or with an organization front. Beware of accepting at face value these wolves in sheep's clothing.

(2) Then there are those zealots who rate the First Amendment above the First Commandment. Do not be deceived by such unreality.

(3) The third group are those narrow minded persons who see a booby man behind each bush, with Protestants looking askance at Catholics and vice versa. Both views are equally obnoxious.

How unrealistic can intelligent, well meaning people get? Fifty to 100 years ago some of these fears were undoubtedly valid. But today such views are unwarranted. Baptists in N.C. and Va. no longer suffer persecution. Mormons no longer are harassed. And Boston witch hunting died with the last century. So why live in the past?

It is absolute demagoguery to assert, or even imply that separation of church and state under the First Amendment means, that in order to comply, the States and the Courts must toss out God and prayer and religion and the Bible from public life.

In writing his opinion, the late Mr. Justice Black (one of the 5) said, "No tax in any amount can be levied to support any religious activity to teach or practice religion." And so saying, he voted to outlaw prayer and the Bible from public schools.

Justice Douglas in his written findings contradicted himself, when he wrote, "As far as interference with the free exercise of religion . . . (and the establishment of religion) are concerned, the separation must be complete and unequivocal." We couldn't agree more. So, why does this confused Justice join with 4 others to "interfere with the free exercise of religion"?

Why did these 5 of 9 mortal men, after more than a century and a half feel the First Amendment had to be re-interpreted by them for 200 million citizens? Why did Justice Douglas and the 4 wrongfully bar prayer and the Bible, God and religion from public schools—and at the same time call for—no interference with the free exercise of religion? Does that make sense to you?

Or, do many of the reasons given for all this confusion appear logical to you? If not—you can help set the record straight—by joining hand and head with those who now undertake to do so.

Every man has a right to his own views. And we respect those views. In a true democracy it shouldn't be otherwise. We will willingly do no injustice or hurt to any, unprovoked. However, it is our plan, tentatively, to raise funds for 3 purposes, namely:

(1) To finance this fight to a successful conclusion.

(2) To help re-elect those Members of the Congress, who consistently stick out their necks to sponsor with us this cause.

(3) To help defeat at the polls in '74, with every thing legitimately at our command,

those who oppose this just cause, side-step, make excuses or fall to vote.

It has been proposed that the following procedure be strictly followed in the future.

(1) For every bill board erected in 1972, erect 20 in 1974. And this time in the district of every Member who has opposed our efforts—Regardless.

(2) For every letter written in '72, 1000 would be written in '74.

(3) For every speaker in '72, there would be 100 in '74.

All Legislators should be aware that, so long as prayer and the Bible are excluded from school life, they are by their inaction helping exclude God and religion from the upcoming generation—and are telling the whole wide world that this is so.

But worse, for 10 long years, adults have been saying to the young minds of America—These Things Are Taboo—Kaput—and Not For You." We've been telling them for 10 years that "It's all right to fill your minds with thoughts of sex and perversion, pornography and vulgarity and smut; with drugs and politics, polluted morality and permissiveness, riot, rape mobocracy, rebellion and Communism. But, nix on God and religion, prayer and—the Holy Bible."

Therefore, in conclusion we affirm, if no prayer is ever again said in any public school; nor Bible ever again read to, or by children; we would and do still insist upon the right of every child, anywhere in America, to pray or not to pray as he may choose; and to read the Holy Bible at any time, in any place, he may so desire. For this still is America—the land of the free and the home of the brave.

May the God who watches over us all, richly bless this Nation and this great people and you. Selah!

BOB SIKES IS HONORED FOR HIS FORESTRY SERVICE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on October 25 last year, at the National Tree Planting Conference in New Orleans, Senator JOHN STENNIS and Congressman BOB SIKES were presented the Distinguished Service Award in Conservation by The American Forestry Association. Congressman SIKES has long been a champion of forestry and conservation and the award is richly deserved. He continues his strong leadership in behalf of forestry incentives legislation that he sponsored in the 92d Congress.

The American Forestry Association is to be congratulated on calling this first National Tree Planting Conference that honored Congressman SIKES. The conference resulted in a rededication of Federal, State, and private forest interests to tree planting throughout the Nation. Actual commitments of 40 million acres to be planted in the next 10 years were made. If we are to meet future needs for forest products as well as other uses and benefits forests can provide, it is important that idle acres be reforested promptly. Private, nonindustrial lands, which comprise nearly 60 percent of all our forests, will not be reforested and managed without government help. Tree planting is one vital step, but additional incentives will be needed.

Congressman Sikes spoke out strongly in behalf of forestry incentives when he addressed the conference in New Orleans.

A summary of the National Tree Planting Conference appears in the January issue of *American Forests* under the title "Accent on Incentives" by James B. Craig.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in the *Record* at this point.

The article is as follows:

ACCENT ON INCENTIVES

(By James B. Craig)

Can America plant enough trees in the next decade to meet the environmental and forest products needs of a growing population? Of course, it can. And it will. Nobody who attended the National Tree Planting Conference in New Orleans has any doubts about that.

Sponsored by The American Forestry Association and nearly 50 allied organizations, the conference was a swinger from the opening kickoff when the band struck up and the State Foresters and Girl Scouts came marching in.

Mark Evans, TV notable, was the star in the kickoff Tree Planting and Arbor Day Pageant at the Rivergate Auditorium that featured our State Foresters and 40 Girl Scouts as directed by Impresario William W. Bergoffen. Each State Forester was handed a tree planting tool by a Girl Scout which he deposited in the appropriate state slot on a long rack while the Eight Naval District Band played his state song and two screens flashed his state tree and official emblem. On the final day the State Foresters retrieved their tools and made their tree planting pledges for the next decade. So did representatives of the federal government and industry.

AFA's official campaign song, "Plant A Tree", was introduced by Television Star Paul Ott. People were soon whistling the catchy tune all over the Rivergate and New Orleans. It's "Tree Time-USA" in America.

State Foresters pledged they will plant 20 million acres in the next decade, the federal government 10 million, and forest industry 10 million. Total so far 40 million acres.

Is it enough? No, but it's a start. Not all the returns are in yet. Five million small woodland owners must be brought fully into the picture. Suburban and urban tree planting needs are not yet sufficiently nailed down. But the total will grow as a strong national campaign and equally strong state programs develop simultaneously. AFA Forester Richard Pardo has been named to head up the national program for the association. Some states are already on the move.

Is enough nursery stock in view? No, not yet, and action is needed. According to John Beale, Deputy Secretary of Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources, projected state and industry nursery production in the next decade of 12 billion trees will fall short of actual need. It will probably be necessary to amend Section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act to expand existing public nursery facilities. These needs must be quadrupled. Private nurseries were represented at New Orleans and can also mount a tremendous effort.

As some are not pointing out, big IF's must be overcome if the biggest ten-year Arbor Day in history is to be a success. But with thought-molders of all ages participating at New Orleans, a groundswell of action began that will spread to the states. The pattern of the first Southern Forest Fire Prevention Campaign is about to repeat itself.

"I have a dream—do you?" declared Frederick McClure, president of the Future Farmers of America, of Texas, as he outlined his hopes for a greener America. His dream is shared by everyone who attended the conference. Equally appealing to the 700 participants were the tree planting exhortations by

Edwin Richard Yarbrough, of Ohio, representing the Boy Scouts of America, and Martha Jo Harrison, of Mississippi, 4-H Club national conservation record book winner.

Congress has already given the Trees for People and Tree Planting programs a big boost by enacting five bills in recent months to aid the effort. One big one still remains—incentives for woodland owners to bring them fully into the tree planting and forest management act—and Senator John C. Stennis, of Mississippi, and Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes, of Florida, pledged at New Orleans that they will reintroduce the bill in the new Congress and see it through. The audience gave them a rousing ovation. The AFA conferred its Distinguished Service Award on both, both have supported every important forestry measure in recent years. Sikes masterminded the quintet of bills enacted last year. Probably no man in the country has done more for forest research than Stennis.

Backing them up was Rep. Wendell Wyatt, of Oregon, who failed to make New Orleans due to weather but who sent his support via a special telephone hookup. Governor Robert Walter Scott, of North Carolina, and a tree farmer in his own right, came to New Orleans to support the tree planting program. So did a number of elected state officials from many other states. All pledged they will go home and start the tree planting ball rolling.

Citing that the need for forest products will double in the next 30 years, Senator Stennis called for enactment of the Forestry Incentives Bill to produce production of timber on small, privately-owned tracts and urged increased financial support for the McIntyre-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Program a 10-year-old effort to improve methods of protecting and developing the nation's woodlands. Goal is a series of orderly annual fund increases aimed at bringing the program to a level of about \$10 million a year, Senator Stennis said. Senator Stennis cited his colleague, Rep. Sikes, who sponsored the incentives bill in the House and said he "worked like a Trojan." Unfortunately, "termites" got into the House Bill, Stennis said, adding that next year will be different. Both Stennis and Sikes praised the work of AFA's Ken Pomeroy, with the former asking Pomeroy to "stand up to be recognized."

Rep. Sikes said "The public needs to understand better the nation's wood needs, the ABC's of renewable resource management of forest lands."

Forestry legislation in which Mr. Sikes has played a major role are P.L. 92-288, for Cooperative Forest Fire Protective, Cooperative forest management and Urban and Environmental Forestry; P.L. 92-421, for National Forest reforestation; and the Rural Development Bill.

The Forestry Incentives Bill passed the Senate but failed in the House, but Mr. Sikes says, "I feel that we have made progress which can insure success in the next Congress."

Under Secretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell and Forest Service Chief John R. McGuire were on hand to urge full cooperation in making the tree planting program a reality. The Forest Service plans to plant five million acres in the next decade. The Soil Conservation Service pledged to plant a million.

Women were particularly active at New Orleans. No newcomer to the drive to take forestry to suburban and urban areas in Mrs. Kermit V. Haugan, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. They started it and she outlined a long list of achievements. Mrs. Howard S. Kittel, first vice president of the National Council of State Garden Clubs, electrified her audience with her exhortations to move on tree planting needs and was interrupted repeatedly by bursts of applause.

Another militant activist who reached the audience was Wayne Dickson, of the Ameri-

can Association of Nurserymen, who stressed the need for a major communications effort. "Trees are our product but communications is our business," he said. "We have to go to the people where the people are, with the right message in the way they understand. We must also listen. We must be constructive managers of change."

Teachers were out in force at New Orleans and hundreds of students examined the superb exhibits and stripper the press room and other outlets of tree planting literature including a thousand special AFA packets. Dean of the group was Miss Viola M. Walker, 80, of 4619 Iberville Street, New Orleans, a teacher for 43 years in New Orleans elementary and high schools. She took notes on speakers and participated in a special tree planting event on the site of Perseverance Hall in the new Louis Armstrong Park.

Perhaps nowhere is the planting fever more pronounced than in the South. The eleven Southeastern states alone plan to plant 14 million acres to trees in rural areas and mount a major effort in urban areas. Some states, such as Georgia, have strong and growing metro forestry programs. According to the Third Forest projections the South must achieve a 70 percent increase in softwood growth and 40 percent more hardwood. As Robert M. Nonnemacher, of the International Paper Company, Mobile, announced, "Foresters are . . . born optimists. Of course, we'll have the trees. Economists and others have forecast a timber famine for at least 50 years and we've always ruined their predictions." But more attention must be given to utilization and the forest land tax situation must be squarely faced, he said.

Like some speakers at the recent World Congress in Buenos Aires, George Weyerhaeuser, president, Weyerhaeuser Company, saw proper allocation of public lands as a basic issue. Also prompt regeneration of forest lands: "We simply cannot longer afford a policy of benign neglect toward that portion of our forest land base . . . best suited for the commercial production of timber." And it must be done fairly, he said. (See page 20).

The story of forests and forestry in the United States "has not been dull," said Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, president, Resources for the Future, and an AFA Director. "Responses to new situations have been dynamic even though in earlier years frequently exploitive both of the environment and people. The responses that will be called for in the future are likely to be quite the opposite of exploitive and characterized by a heightened sense of social and environmental responsibility. I am sure The American Forestry Association will be taking the lead along this path and will be searching for ways to merge environmental improvement with the other factors that go into forest policy and management."

Citing that too quick a plunge into facts and estimates about wood demands in 2000 will mean "too little attention to other aspects of forests that people will regard as more and more important," Dr. Fisher posed the question, "What will Americans want from their forests in the future?"

He outlined three key "wants."

1. They will want a variety of forest products, of course, in changing amounts as time goes on, for their houses, newspapers, furniture, and so forth. They will want these items to be as cheap as possible, of good quality, and reliably available. In addition, Americans, and people in other countries too, will want outdoor recreation that forests offer for camping, hiking, fishing, hunting, photography, painting, and simply being there. And they will want wilderness areas where nobody is, or almost nobody. Soil and water conservation to which good forestry can contribute will be required. Increasingly, people will realize that trees figure in the abatement of pollution: they restore oxygen to the atmosphere; they can shield nec-

essary ugliness such as auto graveyards from view; they absorb noise; they shade the summer sun and color the autumn season.

2. Americans want assurance that wise and acceptable decisions can be reached regarding forests, private decisions as well as governmental ones. The public, at least those who are concerned (and there are many such), wants to be heard at appropriate times and to have some influence on what is decided. Participation in corporation decisions by checking two or three boxes on a proxy form once a year and mailing it in will not be enough; nor will a five-minute presentation at a pro forma public hearing staged by a government agency suffice. More and more people are demanding the chance genuinely to be heard; they crave the dignity that goes with having a voice in what happens to them and things they care about like forests.

3. Finally, Americans want a general understanding that forests and trees will continue forever to be a major part of the American landscape and culture. This feeling, I believe, comes straight out of the hearts and bones of people; it does not arise from any appraisal of future technology or projection of demand and supply. Each person wants for himself and for future generations the opportunity for forest experiences in all the regions where nature makes them possible. These experiences do not have to occur in the wilderness; a maple tree in the backyard or a grove in the park may do as well. The point is that where trees will grow, there should be some trees; otherwise the nature of the place will be denied and, to use Rene Dubos' term, its "genius" will be lost. Certain of our future forest requirements, therefore, are tangible and can be expressed in board-feet while others are intangible and elude expression except perhaps by poets and artists. Forests henceforth, in my opinion, will be expected to contribute to the dynamic totality of American life and their owners will be expected to manage them accordingly.

Dr. Fisher's accent on environmental concern in forest and tree planting enterprises was re-echoed by Tom Kimball, executive vice president of the National Wildlife Federation, who castigated what he called "sawdust forestry" and expressed concern about pine tree monoculture in the South without due regard for hardwoods and "edge" for wildlife.

A sampling of other pertinent comments follow:

William J. Lucas, Regional Forester, Forest Service, USDA, Denver, Colorado and Member of the Board of Trustees of the Arbor Day Foundation:

"While we reap the benefit of trees planted on the first Arbor Day a hundred years ago, we must cultivate the kind of farsighted vision that was J. Sterling Morton's . . . Tree planting decisions and actions implemented by this generation will be felt throughout the Twenty-first Century.

"Today, Arbor Day, with new significance, is a positive answer to Twentieth Century man's ecological and environmental problems . . . 'Trees For People', AFA's Task Force for better forestry on private, non-industrial forest lands, says it all. Now, let's go public and gain their dedication and make this theme a by-word in America." The Arbor Day Foundation, whose concepts and objectives are closely knit with those of the American Forestry Association, "pledges its wholehearted support to your goal of planting 'Trees For People'."

Bruce Zobel, Professor of Forest Genetics, School of Forest Resources, North Carolina State University:

"Nature has produced much variability in our forest trees; our job is to locate and use it. Progress has been spectacular in developing strains that are faster growing, are disease resistant, have better wood and are of better form. We can now grow trees on sites

where they formerly wouldn't survive . . . a great opportunity lies in breeding trees to overcome special problems in urban environments. It is not an easy task to find and breed fume-resistant strains, as well as overcoming public reluctance to spend the energy and finances to help correct adverse urban conditions."

Harry E. Murphy, Association of Consulting Foresters, and President, Resource Operations, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama had the last word:

"Trees will grow practically anywhere there is a little care. Areas of lands that seemed impossible for growing trees are now being planted, such as the spoil banks from mining operations. We can no longer afford idle and lazy acres in this nation."

PANAFLEX—A PINNACLE ACHIEVEMENT

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, California owes a great deal to the motion picture industry. The making of motion pictures, however, involves a great many people behind the scenes whose contributions to this great industry often go unrecognized.

I have recently learned of one organization which has made unusual contributions to the motion picture industry. I am referring to Panavision, Inc., and its dedicated and dynamic president, Robert Gottschalk. Mr. Gottschalk and his company have been responsible for many of the startling, often revolutionary developments in the field of lenses and cameras that have made it possible to film some of the most intricate and most famous sequences in motion pictures.

Mr. Gottschalk has just introduced the most revolutionary camera ever to be used in the industry: a totally silent, hand-held reflex camera, weighing less than 25 pounds, and capable of converting, in less than 60 seconds, into a full studio camera. With this piece of equipment, the cameraman and director can go anywhere and film anything the eye can see.

The new wave of film directors insists on realism. They have been hampered by equipment that often does not allow them to film their subjects in their natural states. Noise is a major problem. Often, in a tight situation, a director has been forced to film the scene and then return to the studio to put on a sound track. With this new camera, he can do everything at one time, saving money and time on the project.

Called the Panaflex, this camera is the pinnacle achievement of Panavision, a company which has been known for its achievements in the past. Robert Gottschalk has been given six Academy Awards for technical improvements over the years and is the only non-British person ever to be given the British Society of Cinematographers Award.

Panavision has been used on more than 1,000 films, among them such classics as "Lawrence of Arabia," "Ben Hur," and others of similar stature. I am pleased to be able to call this company and its leader to your attention.

TARGET: 40 MILLION ACRES OF TREES

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the January issue of American Forests magazine tells of the dramatic accomplishments and goals of the National Tree Planting Conference in New Orleans.

The results of this outstanding meeting in which thousands participated will be far-reaching in that pledges were given for the planting of 40 million acres of trees. The editorial report of this conference should inspire every American who loves our forest lands and who wants to see our forests, not only protected, but enlarged.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues and hereby insert the complete text into the RECORD so that all America can share in this exciting project:

TARGET: 40 MILLION ACRES OF TREES

Trees are the cradle when you are born
Trees are the plow that tills your corn
The threshold over which to carry your bride
The table where she sits by your side
The warmth of the hearth on a cold winter eve

Trees are a gift of God, I believe
Trees are the beds in which you lie
They are the coffins when you die.

Plant a tree and watch it grow
Plant a tree and watch it grow
Time may come and time may go
But that tree will grow and grow.

(From "Plant A Tree", an original ballad written for AFA by Paul Robertson and Alberta Futch. Copyright 1972.)

(By William E. Towell)

More than one tear was shed by an emotion-filled audience as Paul Ott sang this last verse and chorus of our original ballad, "Plant A Tree", to conclude the National Tree Planting Conference in New Orleans. It was a dramatic climax to an inspiring meeting—one that will long be remembered by those who were there.

But the Tree Planting Conference was more than emotion and pageantry. As the roll of states was called, each Forester came forward to the center microphone and pledged his state to tree-planting action for the next decade.

"Alabama, the 'Yellow Hammer' state, pledges 1½ million acres of trees to be planted during the next ten years," said State Forester Bill Moody. "Florida, the 'Sunshine State' will plant three million acres," pledged John Bethea. "Georgia, 3,030,000 acres," said Ray Shirley topping them all.

Not all states could equal the planting opportunities of the South, however, but the cumulative totals soon became impressive. Illinois—85,000 acres, Louisiana—2 million acres, Missouri—110,000, Pennsylvania—250,000, Virginia—850,000, and, finally, Wyoming—31,500 acres. It all added up to a total 20 million acres of trees to be planted by the 50 states in the next decade.

Then came the federal agencies—the Forest Service, the Department of Defense, and Bureau of Land Management, the Park Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and others. And, finally, Bill Ganser, representing the Forest Industries Council, pledged for industry one million acres each year for the next 10 years to bring the grand total up to 40 million acres.

Forty million acres represents a lot of forest. It's about the same area as all of the New England states combined. It's more land

than Arkansas, or Iowa, or Michigan or New York and amounts to about eight percent of all commercial forest lands in the United States. Ambitious as it may appear, however, it still falls short of the estimated 75 million acres that have been judged in need of planting. But it represents a big step forward and, hopefully, a trend that will grow and grow like the planted tree in Paul Ott's beautiful song.

The National Tree Planting Conference in New Orleans was only a beginning. It launched "Tree Time USA", a decade of tree-planting promotion to be spearheaded by The American Forestry Association. It will involve not only the states, the federal government and industry, but all Americans who recognize the importance of trees for a better environment. National and local conservation groups will be asked to join this tree-planting effort. Service clubs, women's organizations, youth groups, and farm clubs all will participate. Through "Tree Time USA" we hope to focus national attention on this vital conservation activity.

Trees will be planted for all benefits and uses, not only for forest production but also for our urban areas. The individual tree to be planted on a city lot will be just as important as the new forest. Landscaping, esthetics, shelterbelts, wildlife and watershed protection will be given equal status with the production of sawlogs and pulpwood. Tree planting will be promoted for all beneficial influences, wherever they may be needed. Through "Tree Time USA" we hope to lead America to a greater appreciation of trees, to develop tree-planting projects and activities that will make this land a better place in which to live. Tree planting is one contribution that every individual can make for a better environment. If participation is the key to appreciation, then here is the opportunity for every American to learn through doing and to improve his own environment in the process.

"Tree Time USA" is here to stay. We invite all AFA members and friends to join us. Forty million acres represents a lot of trees. Won't you help us reach our goal?

You can help by writing your state forester or county extension agent and letting them know you are behind them. Ask your congressmen both on the state and national level to support your state forestry department. AFA forester Richard Pardo is in charge of coordinating the national tree planting effort. Get in touch with him and he will let you know what is going on in your particular area, and how you can help.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES V. SMITH

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we will all be losing a valued friend and former colleague, when Jim Smith returns to his native Oklahoma.

I have known and admired Jim since 1966 when he first came to Congress. He brought an outstanding background to the House of Representatives, with experience in farming and business. Jim is a true farmer who has been active on the farm and in farm related activities since his school days.

As head of the Farmers Home Administration, Jim Smith proved himself to be an excellent administrator willing to take on the tremendous task of revitalizing rural America. He showed his confi-

dence in this important segment of our society. Under his leadership, the Farmers Home Administration has nearly tripled its loan volume, up to nearly \$9 billion outstanding. This program greatly assists American agriculture and thereby benefits our rural communities.

From his activities in the "Build our American Communities" program, Jim has developed the respect and admiration of not only the young people of rural America, but of all generations.

A fine gentleman and dedicated public servant, Jim Smith will be sorely missed by those of us that have had the privilege and pleasure to know and work with him in Washington.

INADEQUACIES OF PRESENT POSTAL SERVICE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents regarding the distressing inadequacies of our present postal service. The letter illustrates problems which are common to all of us. Efficient postal service is vital to us all and I am hopeful that measures can be taken to improve this important service. I submit my constituent's letter as one example of the problems encountered with our present postal service:

CONCO MIDWEST, INC.

Racine, Wis., December 27, 1972.

Postmaster General E. T. KLASSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLASSEN: I feel compelled to write to you as a concerned citizen and businessman regarding our very sick and rapidly deteriorating postal service.

While our postal rates have risen over the past three or four years at an astounding rate, the service has degenerated to an all-time low. My concern involves more than personal irritation, it has caused us undue inconvenience, embarrassment and expense in the conduct of our small business operations.

I point out some specific recent examples. We do considerable business in the Detroit area so we have considerable correspondence with our clients in that area. Three or four years ago we normally had one to two days delivery on first class mail. More recently it has required as much as a week for the same mail to reach Detroit, even when sent air mail.

On October 30, 1972, we sent our weekly payroll checks by air mail to our superintendent at Dearborn, Michigan. When the envelope did not arrive after five days we requested our local post office to trace it. We were told we could not initiate a request for a tracer for at least fifteen days. Obviously our men could not wait that long for their paychecks so we had to stop payment on the checks and issue new ones. Exactly eighteen days later, would you believe it—the envelope containing our original checks were delivered to our consignee at Dearborn!

On another occasion we sent some urgently needed parts by parcel post to the same address. Ten days passed and, when the package had still not been received, we requested our post office to initiate a tracer. We were told that postal regulations required a waiting period of thirty days on regular parcel post shipments!

I ask you Mr. Klassen, is this the kind of postal service we are going to have to accept in a country that is able to send men to the moon in less time than it takes to send a letter to Detroit, or to New York, or even crosstown?

I know I speak for millions of Americans who have become completely disgruntled with our postal service and I believe it is time for people to do something about it. As a result I am submitting copies of this letter to the news services hoping it will be published in the news media throughout the country to motivate a united action by our senators and representatives in Congress to bring about necessary changes in a postal system that was once worthy of its adopted slogan—"Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

If you feel inclined to respond, Mr. Klassen, I'll wait patiently for the mail.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE R. KLICPERA, President.

NEW FDA LABELING PROGRAM IS A CASE OF DECEPTIVE PACKAGING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the 12-part food labeling program announced today by the Food and Drug Administration is a case of deceptive packaging. The FDA promises far more than it is able or even willing to deliver.

This is another example of how the FDA pays lip service to consumer needs but bows to industry pressures in the end. Take away the Madison Avenue window dressing and pious rhetoric and you will find still another example of this administration's probusiness, anticonsumer biases. We are tired of receiving crumbs, no matter how they are labeled or how "nutritional" they are supposed to be. This program is built on the quicksand of those two often-discredited concepts: Voluntary compliance and self-regulation. It has no teeth, no incentive and no guts.

I am encouraged that the FDA is thinking about these problems but the solutions it proposes are inadequate. If the FDA truly believes these new programs are necessary, then it should make them mandatory.

The two major proposals—for nutritional labeling and labeling for cholesterol, fats, and fatty acids—are essentially voluntary in nature for most food products when they should be mandatory. In fact, one of the conditions established as requiring mandatory nutritional labeling—when nutritional claims are made in labeling or advertising of a product—might discourage rather than encourage such claims in order to avoid the FDA labeling requirements.

There should be no loopholes; this type of labeling should be mandatory. That is why I have introduced legislation to do just that—H.R. 1652, the Nutritional Labeling Act.

FDA disclaims authority to require the full ingredient labeling of all food products—including standardized foods—though it professes to desire that au-

thority. However, when I introduced legislation to do just that, the FDA opposed it and put in a bill of its own that simply reworded the present loopholes without really closing them. I think that says a great deal about FDA's commitment to consumers.

THE PASSING OF ROBERT HAYES GORE, SR.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that a good friend and an outstanding civic leader, Robert Hayes Gore, Sr., has died.

With the passing of Governor Gore, the Nation and in particular south Florida has lost a great civic leader, one devoted to progress and the well-being of his fellow citizens. His faith, vision, and confidence in Broward County, and Fort Lauderdale in particular, were major factors in the development of that area, and the success it has enjoyed.

Robert Gore came to Fort Lauderdale as a newspaperman—appointed Governor of Puerto Rico, returning to his real love—the world of journalism. With the establishment of the Fort Lauderdale News in 1929, the Governor announced in his first-day editorial that:

The News will strike the hand of any who would attempt to place barriers between us and our worthy goals. It is to be a paper of the people and will labor to advance their interests . . .

Progress and civic upbuilding were to be the paper's goals.

Governor Gore pursued these goals vigorously, with his typically boundless energy. Never afraid of a battle, his projects ranged from a campaign resulting in the outlawing of the county's gambling houses, to successful opposition of the introduction of the refinery and concrete industries into south Florida's pristine environment.

The efforts of Mr. Gore were not limited to the world of politics and journalism. Although a tough newspaperman and a hard-nosed businessman, he was a generous contributor to philanthropies, particularly those concerning education of handicapped children. When he gave free rent to the Fort Lauderdale school for severely handicapped children, the Governor prayed he would be as successful in helping "handicapped youngsters as I have been in business." His gifts totaling millions of dollars included a campanile for a Roman Catholic Church in Chicago, a convent school in Kentucky, a \$100,000 trust fund for the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind in St. Augustine, a scholarship fund for Negro students in Fort Lauderdale, and many others, including unannounced private gifts.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to convey to my colleagues a sense for the diversity of the contributions of Robert Gore. With his passing we have lost a true rugged individualist who lived intensely,

a man of the people who labored long to advance their interests. My wife Becky and I offer our sincerest condolences to the members of Governor Gore's family.

CHANGING BALANCE OF POWER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, this Nation's media has, in my opinion, placed far too much emphasis on the so-called detente which we are in the process of arranging with Communist world powers, and far too little emphasis on the changing balance of power in the world which may leave the United States without important allies in Europe.

Two of West Germany's leading experts on the subject of power balance, Mr. Ernest J. Cramer and Mr. Dieter Cycon, have recently written excellent analyses of that crucial question which have appeared in West German papers.

I especially want to call to the attention of my colleagues the article by Mr. Cramer, who is noted for his keen perception and insight on international matters. Mr. Cramer speaks from a unique point of view since he lived in America for many years.

Because of their timeliness to the European Security Conference, I hope Members of the Congress will study these articles and I include these two articles in the RECORD at this point:

[Translation of an article in Welt am Sonntag, Dec. 31, 1972]

1972—KREMLIN'S BEST POSTWAR HARVEST

(By Ernest J. Cramer)

Leonid Brezhnev will be rubbing his hands this New Year's Eve. The year's harvest was not only good, it was the best since the end of World War II.

To avoid misunderstandings: we are talking about the political harvest, not the agricultural one. This was miserable, and the continuing drought, especially in the Volga valley, gives hopes of nothing better for 1973.

However the Kremlin can count on the highly industrialized West's help for the agrarian Soviet Union's plight in food supplies also for the coming year. The United States especially will once more hasten to supply huge quantities of wheat—and at most-favored-nation conditions—even if it means rising grain prices in the USA.

But we were going to talk about the political harvest. And 1972 has put a great deal, far too much, in Moscow's granaries:

The President's trip to Peking, which irritated the men in the Kremlin, was followed by Richard Nixon's visit to Moscow—the first appearance by an American Head of State in the Soviet Union.

The first round of SALT talks, the result of which was signed in Moscow during Richard Nixon's visit, ensured quantitative rocket superiority for the Soviet Union. Edward Teller, the nuclear physicist, comments that this puts Moscow in the position to blackmail the USA some day.

Far more important, however, than the President's visit at the Communist Holy of Holies and Russia's success at the talks on arms limitations is the strategic breakthrough in the heart of Europe. The West German treaties with Moscow and Warsaw,

ratified this year by the Bundestag (the West German Parliament), and the "Grundvertrag" (the Basic Treaty between the two parts of Germany) just signed in East Berlin, are the milestones now reached in the Soviets' long-planned march along the political road (to the West in Europe).

All the results which the Soviet Union has draconically enforced in the areas it conquered (during World War II), results which flout the spirit and the letter of the war agreements between Russia and her allies in the war, are now internationally sanctioned. More: the points are now set for the next stage in the advance: the undermining of West Berlin, the derangement of the Western Alliance—with it the ousting of America from Europe—and finally the neutralizing of the non-communist countries of this continent, which is tantamount to hegemony by the Soviet Union.

Subjugation of Europe has been the aim of Soviet policy for half a century. Once before the Soviets believed themselves near this goal: in the chaos of the collapse of the Third Reich and the despair of the early post-war period Josef Stalin thought that Adolf Hitler's estate must fall into his lap like an overripe fruit.

It turned out differently, because the Americans with their President, Harry Truman, whose recent death we mourn, realized that also in their own interest the remaining free part of Europe must be preserved from Russia's grasp; but also because the peoples of this free Europe, including the Germans in what were then the Western zones of occupation, did not want to surrender their newly won freedom to another dictatorship of a different colour.

This was true for a quarter-century; today it seems no longer to apply. The political landscape has changed radically. What Stalin's brutality and Nikita Khrushchev's table-thumping failed to achieve is accomplished by the apparent conciliation of the present ruling class in the Soviet Union.

Of course Moscow's aims have not changed at all. But quite suddenly Communism has become socially acceptable. In France Socialists and Communists have joined in a kind of election alliance, and 59 per cent of the population, a poll shows, take a "positive" view of Communist ministers in a future government. The same applies, with slight shifts of accent, in other countries.

The next great forum for Soviet power politics will be the European Security Conference, which the West German Government has undertaken to support. Moscow's aims for this conference have not changed either; they are simply the ousting of the Americans from Europe, though this is not mentioned so boldly in public any more.

The lever for this ouster will, one day, be West Berlin. Once East Berlin has for an adequate period been generally recognized as the capital of a sovereign state, the military presence of a foreign power will generally be regarded as anachronistic. Presumably the Soviets will then withdraw their troops from East Berlin, and very soon an "enlightened" public opinion, particularly in America itself, will have no further sympathy for American, British and French units remaining in West Berlin.

The pressure of public opinion would compel the Western Allies to vacate their positions in West Berlin. And then? Anyone can visualize the rest of the drama. Anyone who cannot, should recall the words of Valentin Falin, the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, who said "the incorporation of West Berlin" in East Germany was only a matter of time.

Is there a road back? There always is, though return passage is often rougher than the outward trip. The question is, does one want to go back? The road of return will only be trodden provided the majority throughout the world becomes aware of the dangers approaching us. But it looks as though, for the second time this century,

we are going to witness a "too little and too late".

[Translation of an article in Die Welt, Dec. 7, 1972]

AFTER THE ICE-COLD BATH—THE NEW CONFRONTATION

(By Dieter Cycon)

America is the only power able, at least in theory, to halt the all-European drive of the Soviet Union and its friends. It is against the United States that in the end the persistent expansive Soviet policy is directed, all other rivals having been rubbed out or reduced to third-class status.

Only since the West German elections does a notion seem to be drawing in the American press of what may now develop in Europe. The United States had serious grounds for finally boarding the all-European train which many of her present allies helped to set in motion. If Washington wished to hold its European positions against the enormous pressure from the Soviet Union and against the labyrinthine manoeuvres of pro-Soviet forces in western Europe, America would have had to pursue an energetic, forceful, expensive foreign policy. Her leaders could do so only with the support of an awakened public opinion willing to be burdened with responsibility. This basis is lacking for Mr. Nixon.

The American public's political nervous system has been largely unhinged by a chain of internal crises. For psychological reasons the American public is now scarcely able to accept as legitimate zones of American influence abroad. Consequently it can neither clearly define interests abroad nor see when they are endangered or discern the fact of rivalry with other powers. Thus the public at present is neither prepared to bear the costs of adequate strategic and conventional armed forces nor to take on any serious military risks.

For these reasons the Nixon Government has seen the need to cure America's overstrained political nervous system by reducing obligations overseas. And as often happens in such cases, there is the make-believe of making a virtue of necessity. The Soviet Union is seen as being in similar straits; the belief prevails that spheres of interest can be lastingly arranged with her in Europe; so questions of the Western Alliance are given lower priority. Even a quasi-neutral position is considered durable and therefore acceptable for West Germany. Trade questions are to bear the accent in future: more trade collaboration with the former adversary; more trade rivalry with the erstwhile friends.

THE PROBLEM OF THE RUSSIANS

Does this mean that the United States have really resigned themselves to the almighty Soviet influence in "Pan-Europe"? Very probably not. America has fought two world wars; she did not want a continental power of different persuasion to dominate in a "Pan-Europe." She would also have to react with the greatest decisiveness in similar cases in future.

But at present the American nervous debility precludes logical thinking in power politics. The moment when the realities may compel Washington to see the consequences of realisation of the new "Pan-Europe" concept would be like the ice-cold bath which can cure nervous wrecks. And this ice-cold bath could move America to counter-actions commensurate with the volcanic forces she really possesses and can really release in times of need.

This is where the problem lies for the Russians. On the one hand they want to take the chance in Europe which offers itself through America's perhaps merely temporary enervation and through the possibly transient good fortune of a Brandt Government in West Germany; on the other hand they

want to prevent their American rival from awakening from his lethargy before the global balance of forces has shifted decisively in his disfavour. This means that the Soviets must bring about an irrevocable transformation in the situation in their own favour—unnoticed by the Americans until too late. Instead of the ice-cold bath, they and their fellow-travellers in western Europe prescribe further luke-warm showers for the American nerve-patient.

When America's eyes were on Asia and the domestic scene, the Russians first wore down her European allies and then harnessed them to pull in the all-European conferences; they turned Europe's slippage from the American to the Russian camp into a gentle, almost imperceptible process. With this method they dipped the European question in oil. The Americans find no point where they could or should intervene and hold fast. It is the aim and the effect of this concept that America is in a position to cry out only when the morsel Europe has fallen entirely into Russian hands.

AT THE RHINE—OR THE CHANNEL?

Since the German election results of November 19 all questions boil down to this: When will the Americans notice that the peace tune has deceived their ears? When they do notice, the spotlights will switch again to Europe and a phase of confrontation with Russia will emerge which may be far more embittered and dangerous than former confrontations.

But along what geographical lines will the future confrontation—end-product of the prize-winning "peace policy"—take place? Will the Americans by then be able seriously to wrestle for their positions in West Germany?

One pre-requisite would be to put their armed forces in Europe on a level with the Russians' (instead of reducing them) and on this basis to pursue an appropriate policy for Germany. The day they took this decision would also be the beginning of a new collision with the Russians. It is questionable whether the USA can take the plunge until the last political scientist at Harvard has grasped the rudiments of world politics. America will certainly not launch this new policy as long as the West Europeans help the Russians to apply the tactics of luke-warm water and lubricating oil.

So long as a voice from Europe fails to tell the Americans with the necessary clarity where the "Pan-European" train is travelling to, the most interesting open question in Europe will be where the new line of withdrawal for Russo-American confrontation will run. At the Rhine—provided France shakes off the "Pan-European" embrace in time for a new entente with London and Washington? Or at the English Channel—assuming England remains the only free country in Europe?

WILSON AND THAYER U.S.A. TOP BUSINESSMEN

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, Dallas is proud of the distinctive recognition given to two of her most dynamic leaders. Robert C. Wilson, president of Collins Radio Co., and Paul Thayer, chairman of LTV Corp., were just named as two of America's 10 outstanding business leaders for 1972.

This salute came from Gallagher Presidents' Report in its January issue.

Robert C. Wilson, president of Collins Radio Co., was cited "for dramatic turnaround via \$40 million reduction of expenses, \$56 million decrease in short-term debt, reorganization of operations into 13 profit centers."

Paul Thayer, chairman of LTV Corp., was cited "for successful restructuring of conglomerate's debt-plus program of cost controls to result in first profitable year since 1968."

Dallas is recognized from coast to coast as America's leading business city. We attribute this progressive record of achievement to the chief executives with their creative genius. In every field, these hard-working, inspirational dynamos set the spark.

Thanks to Gallagher for their perceptive selection of Paul Thayer and Bob Wilson of Dallas, two of 10 on the All American Business Leadership Team.

CONFESSIONS OF A CAPITALIST

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, we all hear a great deal of talk about the free enterprise system, but few citizens have pursued their advocacy as far as has Robert W. Bunke, of Rushford, Minn.

In the form of six consecutive advertisements begun January 7 in the Winona, Minn., Daily News, Bunke has taken to the public his story of free enterprise and America's heritage of freedom.

Mr. Bunke is dissatisfied with the timidity of some business spokesmen who discuss these issues evasively. He seeks an open discuss of the free enterprise system as an integral part of America.

With the sincere conviction that effective communication first demands trust on both sides, he has purchased this print advertising space in order to express his concern about the public's increasing hostility toward business, and to attempt to open a constructive dialog between the two sides.

Robert W. Bunke is executive vice president and general manager of the Ace Telephone Association, Houston, Minn., and executive vice president of Central Communications Corp., of Tomah, Wis.

As a businessman who owns stock in his company and wants to make a profit, he is, by the Marxist definition, a capitalist and the alleged "oppressor of the working class." For this reason he calls his printed commentaries "Confessions of a Capitalist."

Mr. Bunke focuses on the issue of profit in the following excerpt from his series:

Is profit immoral? An economic force that makes possible the world's highest paid labor force and the best standard of living is a blessing, not a curse.

Yet Opinion Research Corporation notes a decline in the percentage of people who think everybody benefits from big companies' profits. In 1959, 60 percent of the public agreed. By 1971 this had declined to 51 percent.

What is rising is the public's estimate of how much profit goes to the average manufacturer from each sales dollar after taxes. In 1951 when profit was 5.1 cents, the public estimated 18 cents. In 1971, when profit declined to 4.2 cents, the estimate climbed to 28 cents. (Source of profit data: Federal Trade Commission and Securities Exchange Commission.)

Critics of our free enterprise system admit that it creates much wealth. But they charge that this wealth is not shared and that the capitalist grabs most of it. Yet the truth is that for every dollar a company sets aside for dividends and retained earnings, the firm also sets aside about nine dollars for payrolls and employees' benefits.

I have met some businessmen who . . . seek only profits and ignore the public they are supposed to be serving . . . but they are fortunately in the minority. They are actually inefficient capitalists because they fail to realize that a business can't profit unless it . . . satisfies customers by given them quality goods or services at reasonable prices. Then the profits that result are a reward to the business for meeting the needs of the consumer. . . .

The dedicated capitalist enjoys his work and achieves satisfaction from serving people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. Bunke for his much needed contribution to the discussion of one of our oldest and most respected institutions, the American free enterprise system.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF PRIESTLY ORDINATION OF REV. WENCESLAUS A. UHLIR

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 the members of St. Procop Church of Cleveland, Ohio, will honor the 50th anniversary of priestly ordination of their pastor, Rev. Wenceslaus A. Uhlir.

During the past 50 years, Father Uhlir has rendered remarkable service to the people of the Cleveland area. He has been pastor of St. Procop Church since 1949, and before that he served at Holy Family Church and Our Lady of Sorrow Church. In these capacities he has benefited innumerable parishioners with his wisdom, guidance, and energetic activity to develop the church.

In tribute to Father Uhlir, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following statement of his accomplishments. In addition to my warmest congratulations, I extend to Father Uhlir my best wishes for many more years of good health and good work.

The statement follows:

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PRIESTLY ORDINATION OF FATHER WENCESLAUS A. UHLIR

Reverend Wenceslaus A. Uhlir was born on the West Side of Cleveland on September 14, 1898. His parents, John and Mary, came from Bohemia to America, married and built their home on old Brooklyn Street which is now West 31 Street. John and Mary together with other Czech families were pioneer members and founders of St. Procop Parish.

It was at St. Procop Church where Father

Uhlir was baptized, received his First Communion and Confirmation. He attended St. Procop School, St. Ignatius High School and College (now John Carroll University). In 1918 he answered God's call by entering St. Bernard Seminary in Rochester, New York. His theological studies were completed here in Cleveland at St. Mary of the Lake Seminary. His parents and family saw Father Wenceslaus Uhlir ordained a priest by Bishop Schrembs on February 24, 1923 and attended his First Solemn High Mass at St. Procop Church on Sunday, February 25, 1923.

On March 25, 1923 Father Uhlir was assigned as assistant pastor to Holy Family Parish in Cleveland. It was here that Father spent six fruitful years in God's and man's service. On June 13, 1929 he became the pastor of Holy Family Church in Parma, with Our Lady of Sorrows Church in Peninsula, Ohio, as a mission. Since neither parish had a rectory, Father Uhlir resided at Holy Family on the East Side of Cleveland, and like a missionary priest commuted to Parma and Peninsula every Sunday to offer Holy Mass.

In 1930 Peninsula was established a separate parish freeing Father Uhlir to devote all his time and energy to the Parma community and Holy Family Parish. The Parma parish at this time was a farm community of 54 families, with a little red brick church seating about 100 and a small hall. Father Uhlir became first resident pastor of Holy Family in Parma when he built a rectory after buying additional property for the parish. He soon organized various church clubs and activities. Holy Name Society, Ladies Guild, Dramatic Club, baseball and bowling teams were started under his direction. During Father Uhlir's pastorate the parish community grew rapidly and by 1949 there were 400 families registered in the parish and the erection of a school was begun.

In the war years Crile Army Hospital was built on York Road. Father Uhlir became the Catholic Chaplain to the hospitalized Army men at Crile. Since there was no transportation for soldiers and patients to find recreation elsewhere, Father started a canteen in his parish hall for them. It was he who solicited bands to provide music and the business men to provide refreshments. This canteen remained in existence throughout the war years.

On August 17, 1949, after twenty years of hard and fruitful work in Parma, but before school was completed, Archbishop Hoban asked Father Uhlir to become pastor of St. Procop Parish in Cleveland. So it was that Father Uhlir returned to his place of birth and baptism.

Father has been with us at St. Procop Parish nearly twenty-four years. During these years he served his people as a loving father and a good shepherd. In a material and temporal way he has done wonders among us. He repaired, redecored the church and is maintaining its fine condition. He renovated the school, installed a cafeteria, and made vast necessary repairs and improvements on all parish buildings. He was always insistent upon an excellent educational program in the elementary grades, and in high school until its closing in 1965, of St. Procop School. And no one can measure the spiritual blessings that have come to the people of St. Procop through the kind conscientious spiritual labors of Father Uhlir.

Father Uhlir was the youngest of nine children born to his parents. Four of the children died in childhood; the eldest son, Frank, died as a young man (leaving a widow and two children and now survived by grandchildren only). Two sisters, Sister M. Benedicta and Sister M. Rosalia, both gone to their eternal reward, also dedicated their lives to God by becoming Sisters of St. Joseph of Cleveland. A married sister, Bridget, who died a few years ago, is survived by husband, Frank Zicharek, and their two married daughters,

Rita and Rosalia. Many grandnephews, grandnieces, and cousins are proud of their relationship with Father Wenceslaus Uhlir.

On February 25, 1973 St. Procop parishioners will pay tribute to Father Uhlir as he celebrates his Golden Anniversary of his Priestly Ordination and First Solemn Mass. On that date, brother-priests, relatives, parishioners and friends will come together to congratulate Father Uhlir and to wish him many more years of health and priestly ministry. No amount of gifts can repay Father Uhlir for all he has done for all of us. In gratitude we can only pay a tribute by saying, "thank you and God reward you, Father Uhlir. Ad multos annos."

THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL COMMANDER VISITS RUSSIA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished national commander of the American Legion, Joe L. Matthews, visited Soviet Russia and Communist Poland recently and conferred with governmental and veteran leaders of those countries.

The American Legion has long taken a great interest in matters relating to the national security and foreign affairs, and I was very pleased when Joe Matthews told me that he had the opportunity to visit Russia and I encouraged him to go. I believe Members of Congress will find his report, which follows, most interesting:

AN ADDRESS BY JOE L. MATTHEWS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be here in the Nation's capital with Legionnaires from the Department of the District of Columbia, especially so close to an historical event—the inauguration of the President.

I realize that you Legionnaires are quite use to the comings and goings of heads of state, and being very close to top news events on an almost daily basis. But at the risk of sounding like I'm trying for equal time, I would like to tell you about a unique experience I had as the National Commander.

Most of you, I am sure, are aware that I made a 10-day visit in mid-December to Soviet Russia and Communist Poland. We felt the trip was both desirable and necessary if the Legion is to maintain its tradition of being abreast of world affairs and in tune with trends of the times.

Certainly we are in tune with modern day trends, for our President visited both major communist capitals of Peking and Moscow during this past year in an effort to enhance the possibilities of peace on earth. As you well know, The American Legion supported those trips by the President as being peace seeking in nature.

We felt we might make some further contribution to the cause of peace if we established a contact between American war veterans, through The American Legion, and the war veterans of those communist countries which we visited.

Before I touch on some of the highlights of this visit, and I still think it was a most worthwhile venture, let me reassure you that The American Legion is not going soft on communism and neither is the National Commander.

I am proud to be an American. I am proud

to be an American Legionnaire. I believe in our system and I believe it is absolutely the best system, and the best way of life that man has yet devised. I felt this way before leaving for the Iron Curtain countries, and my feelings are unchanged today.

To say the least, however, I am excited about some of the possibilities this trip may have opened up, and I think that you too, as concerned citizens, will share this excitement in the knowledge that your own organization, The American Legion was open-minded and far-sighted enough to seize upon this opportunity.

While our visit concentrated on the veteran to veteran aspects of our relationships we were invited to the office of Mr. Alexei Pavlovich Shitikov, the presiding officer of one of the two bodies of the Supreme Soviet who told us his people were impressed by agreements concluded by President Nixon last spring, and willing to support all means to promote world peace.

Hope and cautious optimism would seem to best describe the feelings which we brought away from the Soviet Union.

Now let me again reassure you that our communist hosts did not sell us anything. As far as The American Legion is concerned, it is performance, not promise, that pays off in international relationships.

There must, however, be a time and a place of beginning if there is to be a genuine relaxation in international tensions brought about by years of cold war, power politics and mutual distrust. There simply must be dialogue between nations at levels other than heads of state if we are going to make any progress along these lines.

The world, it seems, grows smaller with each passing day. We have seen tremendous technological developments in transportation, communications and weapons systems, that have made the most remote spot on earth but a few minutes distant. The shrinking globe warns us that it becomes increasingly important for people of diverse cultures, backgrounds, national origins and political persuasions to know and understand each other better.

Americans, for the most part, recognize the right of other peoples to choose the methods by which they will be governed. In return, we would ask only that other peoples of the world would recognize that principle and refrain from trying to impose their will upon others whose free choice might differ from theirs.

We don't expect there will be any overnight miracles which will make international understanding, and peace, a quick and easy reality. We do face, and recognize, the fact that it is going to have to start somewhere if it is going to come about at all.

With regard to our Iron Curtain visit, it must be conceded that The American Legion reaps a by-product which may not be important to anyone but us, but we do consider it important. This visit should dispel once and for all the stereotyped notion of an American Legion that is hide bound by tradition and incapable of change.

The American Legion has a great respect for tradition, but we always have been willing to explore new avenues and to consider new approaches that might be instrumental in helping bring about solutions to some of mankind's major problems.

Our Children and Youth program, and other programs of the Legion, have retained their vigor and their value for more than a half century because the Legion has been willing and capable of adapting to the needs of the times. We are not about to outlive our usefulness now, for we have much more to contribute to America.

Our first meeting with our hosts came at plane-side on our arrival in Moscow, on

Monday. And here is where we received the first of many pleasant surprises. Usually a detailed itinerary is laid out for a visit of this type, but in this case there was none, and we were whisked through customs in VIP fashion by officials of the Soviet War Veterans Committee. And it was so fast, that personnel from the American Embassy did not catch up with us until we were already checked into our hotel.

On Tuesday morning we were privileged to meet with the United States Ambassador to Russia, Jacob Beam. Later that day we had our first meeting with the Soviet War Veterans Committee, and another pleasant surprise came when we asked and received permission to take photos and to record the interview.

At this and at all subsequent meetings we were asked to discuss the Vietnam situation. In each instance we declined on the basis that this was not the purpose of our visit, nor was it within our purview to discuss Vietnam. I might suggest that some people here at home would be well advised to a little less sounding off on a situation which is at a critical point and about which none of us is as well informed as those who are handling the negotiations.

On Wednesday as a gesture of good will I placed a wreath on the Tomb of the Soviet Unknown Soldier in Red Square and also met with the Minister of Health. On Thursday I also met with the Minister of Social Security and then we were given a tour of a clinic and a prosthetics laboratory. It was in the area of prosthetics that we saw impressive work being done by the Soviets.

Using bio-electrics, a team of Soviet scientists, including doctors, engineers and allied professions, have developed an artificial arm which employs sensors to respond to movement of muscle endings in the stump. It provides wrist and hand movement strong enough for most situations, yet delicate enough to pick up a glass. The arm has been perfected and we saw it in operation.

Friday we visited with Mr. Shitikov (as I mentioned earlier) in the Kremlin. This high ranking Soviet official (equivalent to our Speaker of the House, or Senate President) spent 40 minutes listening to our comments concerning our visit. I am assured by those in a position to know, that our meeting with this Soviet dignitary was indeed out of the ordinary, possibly the best indicator we could have gotten of the desire of the Soviets to continue the climate of improved relationships between our two nations, and the importance they attach to the ability of The American Legion to help in achieving this goal of peace.

We took a train from Moscow to Leningrad where on Saturday we visited the cemeteries containing the mass graves of those who died in the World War II siege of the city by the Germans. On Sunday we had a chance to see the defense lines used by the people of Leningrad during the siege. We also had a chance to take a side trip to the city of Pushkin that has the great palaces used by royalty in old Russia.

Our visit to Leningrad finished on Monday with a meeting with a high official of the Soviet War Veterans Committee based in Leningrad and with the deputy mayor of this city. Monday night we flew to Budapest, Hungary, and then on to Warsaw, Poland.

Tuesday, we met with officials of the Polish War Veterans Committee and were showed documentary films captured from the Germans, which showed the systematic destruction of Warsaw during World War II. That evening we were guests at a dinner hosted by the War Veterans Committee.

In Warsaw too, I placed a wreath on the Tomb of the Polish Unknown Soldier. The Tomb was erected after World War I, and just about destroyed when the Nazis made

their attempt to raze Warsaw. It is kept under a 24 hour a day military honor guard, and it is interesting to note that the Tomb has been kept in partial ruins to remind the people of the devastation visited on their city. Our visit to Warsaw concluded our trip and on Wednesday we returned to America.

Since my return, I have been asked by a number of people how I would assess the accomplishments of this first American Legion visit to the Soviet Union and Poland—successful, unsuccessful, or somewhere in between. The answer must be that we have made only a small step through a door held very tentatively ajar. That the step has been taken, and that we were so warmly received must place the stamp of moderate success on our visit. Obviously, it was impossible for us to come up with all the answers, but I believe strongly that the way has been paved for a significant Legion contribution to that much sought after goal of a "generation or more of peace." It isn't necessary to tell you that veterans as a group are highly dedicated to the elimination of war as a means of resolving differences. We found this to be as true of the Soviet and Polish war veterans we met as it is with Legionnaires.

Having established these relationships with the Soviet and Polish war veterans, the next step is clearly up to us. They have explained their positions in their own homelands, and they are watching and waiting for us to do something positive to keep our relationship alive. In the realization that matters could not remain at dead center, I have formally invited the veterans groups from both nations to send representative delegations to our upcoming meetings for the purpose of meeting with Legion officials to explore means for further strengthening ties.

As National Commander, I have also urged Legionnaires everywhere who have the opportunity to consider a trip to the Soviet Union and Poland. To see the people and hear their views will, I can assure you, be an interesting and rewarding experience.

If what I have brought out in this report to you seems on the positive side, let me say it was intended to be, for I am firmly convinced that only in dealing with the situation in a positive way will we be able to solve the many problems inherent in the achievement of better relationships with the Eastern bloc countries. Equally positive however, must be our insistence on certain conditions to agreement, as indeed the Soviets have done. Most important of these are:

1. Our moves in the direction of detente must be undertaken on the basis of full consultation with our allies. This is an established Legion position.

2. As I pointed out earlier, we must deal from a position of strength, meaning a level of military preparedness sufficient for any contingency as well as large enough to provide a negotiating basis for future arms limitation agreements.

3. While recognizing legitimate Soviet aspirations, we must insist on the basis of genuine reciprocity—of equal give and take on both sides.

Our former Ambassador to Moscow George Kennan once said, concerning Soviet-U.S. relations:

"Somewhere between the intimacy we cannot have, and the war there is no reason for us to fight, there is a middle ground of peaceful, if somewhat distant coexistence on which our relationship could be considerably safer and more pleasant than it now is."

It is my firm opinion that we have taken the first step toward the attainment of that "middle ground" and I urge all of you to do everything in your power to continue the momentum of that first step to the end that our children, our grandchildren and the generations as yet unborn may never have to experience the dreadful consequences of war.

WOMEN'S RESEARCH CENTER

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the Queensborough Community College in New York City has opened a Women's Research and Resource Center on its campus which will act as a clearinghouse of data on the problems of women and provide free counseling services. This most interesting and needed project became a reality as the result of the efforts of many individuals but special commendation should go to Queensborough Community College President Dr. Kurt R. Schmeller.

The Long Island Press article, dated December 26, 1972, opening of the new center, contains the background on this project and an explanation of the goals of the center. I am inserting the text of that article for the attention of my colleagues who are concerned with the rights of women and the need for improved services addressed to the needs of women:

[From the Long Island Press, December 26, 1972]

WOMEN'S RESEARCH CENTER IS NOW OPEN FOR BUSINESS

(By Frances Wegner)

A home base for the feminist movement, a center where problems of women can be approached academically, was opened on the campus of Queensborough Community College last Wednesday, thanks in a large measure to the school's president, Dr. Kurt R. Schmeller, his executive assistant, Dr. Eleanor Pam and her administrative assistant, Ms. Audrey Silva.

A site to open a Women's Research and Resource Center was sought for some time by the City University of New York Women's Coalition with no success, until Dr. Schmeller agreed to give them space on the Bay-side campus. The center opened with a gala reception attended by such notables as Assemblywoman Rosemary Gunning, Assemblymen John A. Esposito and V. F. Nicolosi, and Dr. Belle Zeller, president of the Professional Staff Congress.

The project, as planned by the CUNY Women's Coalition, will serve as a clearinghouse of data on women's problems, both published and unpublished. Dr. Pam said that to date women's studies are not considered legitimate scholarly works and do not get published. One exception is a feminist press called KNOW, operated by two women in Pittsburgh, Pa.

They plan to use the center for sensitivity and consciousness-raising sessions and to offer career counseling and job placement, all free and open to the public.

"The area around the college offers a good example of what we hope to accomplish," Dr. Pam said at an interview in her office. "In this neighborhood there are many college-trained housewives with school-age children. They are unable to find paying jobs, if for no other reason than that the employer must cooperate and work her hours around home responsibilities," she went on.

"We can counsel them on how to prepare for jobs, we can educate the employer so he bends a little. Women who are depressed by stagnating at home make very satisfactory employees . . . they are the best economic buy on the market," she added.

Although not confined to serving university personnel, the undertaking has been

underwritten entirely by the college community. Once Dr. Schmeller agreed to provide space, the women of the coalition turned to the student body for funds to purchase the house and to underwrite the cost of the opening reception. In addition, the center will tap such university facilities as the job placement bureau, and a marriage and psychiatric counseling service.

"Women have made great strides in the past five years," Dr. Pam stated, "but there has been a lot of anger and frustration, particularly among CUNY women. We felt the energy generated by these emotions could be directed in a constructive manner, in an atmosphere appropriate to a university, by finding an outlet for a systematic, substantive pursuit of women's legitimate interests," Dr. Pam said in explaining how the idea for a center was born.

"Our goal is to place only qualified women, to weed out opportunists and not allow them to use the movement for their own ends. We intend to keep a clean house."

Asked what she felt were still legitimate goals for the movement, Dr. Pam spotlighted education, which traditionally was tended to cast girls in stereotype roles. "We must enlarge possibilities for women from their earliest years, their choices should be broader," she said.

Dr. Pam's own career is an example of how family pressures can divert a woman from her real interests.

"I majored in philosophy as an undergraduate," she said, "but when I graduated my father was against going on with my education. He couldn't see any economic opportunity in an advanced degree in philosophy. 'Be a teacher', he said."

She did that, but continued her education nevertheless, earning masters degrees in English literature and in guidance, and a doctorate in guidance and student personnel.

"I still followed the traditional path," she went on, "marrying as expected, having a child as expected. But I did not stay at home and set aside my career for 20 years, which was also expected."

"I can readily understand that women who sacrificed the security of marriage for the sake of a career can be very bitter when they find they do not advance because of discrimination against their sex," she went on. "We expect the center will provide a bank for top talent, and hope to place highly qualified women in top government positions."

Audrey Silva feels Dr. Pam is a symbol to many women, who have long been opposed to rules regarding maternity in the city university system.

"Women were forced to take a full term off without pay, until a recently negotiated contract change that," she said.

"But Dr. Pam, faced with the old ruling, took matters in her own hands. Never mind maternity leave, she said, and worked until the day before the birth, stayed out a few days and returned to work."

Women in the coalition felt she had demonstrated the rules were archaic.

"But while she showed women have been underestimated traditionally, she is only one of many courageous, determined women," Ms. Silva added. "There is no room for stars in the movement, we have no hierarchy."

Dr. Schmeller believes the new center is a worthy academic enterprise.

"I hope it will serve as a model in elevating the status of women," he said, and he pledged to tap the full resources of the academic community to that end.

"In the eight years I have been at Queensborough," he said, "I have seen women move out of essentially home economics, nursing and education, into broader fields," he went on.

"For example, we have on our staff presently a number of talented young biologists who hold doctorates."

"By working with the center we can find what women's needs are and help fill them through our evening division and general studies programs," he went on. "We must be ready and willing to find talent wherever it is."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—1973

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries the Ukrainian people have maintained a strong sense of separate identity.

The eternal ties of family, language, customs, ethnic history, and nation run particularly strong in all the Ukrainian Americans I have known. And I am convinced that these ties remain very strong for the 47 million Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R., despite the relentless efforts of the Russian majority to radically alter them.

January 22 marks the 55th anniversary of the Ukraine's brief independence. It is the largest of the captive nations in both the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. And its history, its struggles, and its involuntary entrance into the U.S.S.R. deserve the attention of the elected representatives of the American people.

Nationalism has emerged as the strongest "ism" in Eastern Europe. The nationalism of Ukrainians, as indicated by the evidence of persistent arrests and cultural repressions, may be as strong or stronger than that similar phenomenon demonstrated in the last two decades in Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia.

Our own pluralistic society in America is the beneficiary of those men and women, from many lands, who felt a duty to find within themselves a tie to their ancestors and to preserve the language, religion, culture, history of their own people. They helped carry the race forward.

Generations of anonymous Ukrainians have worked, loved, and died. But they have left children and grandchildren daring enough, and informed enough, to carry forward the struggle.

The lot of this generation of Ukrainians has not been an easy one. A superpower exerts a suffocating embrace. But the lot of Ukrainians has never been easy.

The people of the Ukraine have never been truly afforded the right of self-determination. Who can say that they will ever succeed? But events change, the course of history affords surprises and successes as well as defeats. We cannot be certain that the hope of Ukrainian people are doomed. Clearly, the signs of unending struggle reveal that Ukrainians will contest the heavy odds and will refuse to permanently surrender the field to their adversaries.

Each valorous deed reverberates, honoring the past, lighting the path to the future.

We have a sort of emerging United

States-Russian detente today. But this Ukrainian Independence Day reminds us that we should be careful not to romanticize the state of the world. There is a very dark side to the nature of the Soviet Union.

I am pleased, therefore, to join in this observance, to recognize the feelings of the Ukrainian people, and to pause in respectful thanks for humanity's restless search for the blessings of freedom.

OBSERVES 13TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this month the Armed Forces Benefit and Aid Association, commonly known as the benefit association, is observing the 13th anniversary of its founding. This makes it one of the oldest fraternal, social, patriotic, and beneficial associations of U.S. military personnel. This organization was founded by military personnel to enable them to contribute their services to their communities in an organized way and to provide military personnel with services previously unavailable to them. The benefit association is a nonprofit organization and is supported entirely by its members.

The Armed Forces Benefit and Aid Association supports recognition awards for outstanding and heroic service to the community. It recognizes contributions to the association from its members with its legion of honor program. And it informs members of pending legislation affecting the rights and interests of military personnel and provides an effective voice for them to communicate with their legislators.

The benefit association and organizations with which it has associated provide members with a number of important services, many of which meet the special needs of members of the Armed Forces. Some of these many services are:

First. An emergency loan service which lends money to members and their families in case of death or unusual medical or dental expense by a member of the family. The association provides this service for only a nominal charge.

Second. A pending supplementary medical insurance program which pays civilian medical charges not covered by CHAMPUS, the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services.

Third. A group purchasing plan that enables members to make substantial savings on many purchases.

Fourth. An unusual insurance program that provides members with life insurance and at the same time enables him to earn as much as 7-percent interest and more on his contributions to the program.

Fifth. A free counseling service in which a counselor meets with the member and his wife to advise them about wills, documents necessary to obtain benefits to which they are entitled, and

other important papers. The counselor gives every member and his wife a book written exclusively for the benefit association by an attorney that contains essential information, gives addresses, and shows the necessary form for obtaining these documents. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, the benefit association provides its members with an invaluable service.

Sixth. A car protection service which offers rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of anyone stealing a member's car.

Seventh. A worldwide blood-type file for its members which enables them or their families to get blood quickly when they need it.

Eighth. A banking and loan service through one of America's largest banks, which enables a member to maintain a single checking account no matter where he moves anywhere in the world and also to keep his credit established during the frequent moves he is required to make.

These are only some of the unique and valuable services the benefit association offers the members of our Armed Forces. It is also developing many other services, including low cost van moving and a low cost air travel plan.

This rapidly growing organization was formed, Mr. Speaker, to meet the unique needs of the men and women who serve our country in its Armed Forces. Such an organization promises great good for our military personnel and their families and deserves the strongest support of every American.

VETERANS OF ALLIED ARMIES

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to assist former members of the armed forces of nations allied with United States during World Wars I and II. This bill, which is identical to one I sponsored in the last Congress, would provide qualified veterans who have lived in this country for at least 10 years with well deserved benefits: certain hospital and nursing home care, medical services, rehabilitation, as well as farm, home, and business loans.

Although French, Belgians, Italians, and others would be assisted by passage of this bill, former members of the Polish Army now living in the United States would benefit most. The record of the Polish Army in both major conflicts has been nothing less than exemplary. During World War I, Americans of Polish ancestry along with recent Polish emigres formed a Polish Army which participated in the final Allied victory. Following this conflict, many returned to America to continue their new lives. In the Second World War, portions of the Polish Army made their way to the West where their efforts were a credit to themselves and their land.

These brave and proud men distinguished themselves in the Battle of Britain, Narvik, Tobruk, the murderous storming of Monte Cassino, and the final

assault against the Third Reich. In noting the capture of Monte Cassino by the 2d Polish Corps, 5th Army Gen. Lucian K. Truscott stated that.

The men of Poland were in the vanguard of that battle fighting with the same tenacious purpose that has ever made the name of Poland a byword among liberty loving people.

Also, "the outstanding leadership and tactical ability" of the Polish commander, Gen. W. L. Anders, was described by President Roosevelt as "primary contributions to the success of Allied Forces in the Italian campaign." General Eisenhower echoed the praise of his fellow officers by stating that,

The Poles had "contributed so heroically to victory in Europe."

After the final victory, most Polish veterans hoped to live in a free Poland where they could fulfill their dreams of freedom, peace, and security. However, when their beloved country fell under the yoke of yet another tyrant, thousands of their number refused to return home. Unwilling to sacrifice their love of liberty, these gallant veterans emigrated to various countries of the West, especially to the United States. In the past generation, they settled in our Nation where they became honest, hard-working citizens.

These veterans shared the hardships and suffering of war. Yet, they are not allowed to share in the benefits accorded their American brothers-in-arms. As one Polish veteran wrote, many of his number believe that "in the name of fairness and justice" all soldiers of the Allied Forces should have access to the same veterans' privileges. Both Canada and Britain have acknowledged their responsibilities to veterans of allied armies, provided they became citizens of those countries. France, New Zealand, and Australia also provided certain benefits.

The United States partially opened the doors to veterans benefits for allied veterans, leaving the stipulation that such rights could only be given following an agreement between the United States and the respective Allied governments. These agreements were reached with Canada, Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. Because of the onset of Communist domination of Poland, the agreement was never concluded. For this reason, former members of the Polish Army who live in our country have never had the opportunity to achieve these benefits.

To help right the wrongs of the past, I introduced a bill in the last Congress. Correspondence in support of the legislation came to me from Polish-Americans, and Polish veterans' organizations in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, California, Washington, Indiana, Delaware, and Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, more than 40,000 veterans of the Polish Army now reside in the United States. These men fought valiantly for the ideals of liberty so deeply cherished by all of us. Their service and dedication reflect a devotion to freedom and a willingness to defend it that has been inspirational to Americans throughout our Nation.

Through no fault of their own, these

veterans did not have the free homeland to return to that other allies enjoyed. Rather than submit to tyranny, they emigrated to the West where they and their children have set an example of civic duty and love of country.

Passage of the bill I have introduced today will in a small way show our appreciation for the many sacrifices made by these veterans. Passage of this bill will also help spare them the agony of poverty and suffering many now endure as they grow older and are unable to meet increased physical and financial burdens.

General Eisenhower once said:

The Free World will always remember their sacrifice.

It is time we act upon his words.

MESA, ARIZ., JUNIOR HIGH SERVICE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following report of the service projects performed by the students of Mesa Junior High School, Mesa, Ariz., over the past 7 years. I think our Mesa youngsters who have undertaken and accomplished projects of such value and importance deserve a great deal of commendation—and I take my hat off to them for jobs well done.

The report follows:

MESA JUNIOR HIGH EXCELS IN SERVICE PROGRAM

Students of Mesa Junior High School (Mesa is a city near Arizona's capital) have for many years acquired and maintained the reputation of being service minded. During the past seven years, the student body has raised \$22,850 for service projects. In addition to the fund-raising successes, many hours of donated service by the students have not only provided enjoyment, but has been instrumental in developing attributes of generosity, concern, and a willingness to want to help people in need of support.

Contributions for the projects consisted of: \$2,800 to move a building onto the property of the Mesa Association for Retarded Children (for which the Freedoms Foundation Award was received) with an additional \$3,800 for the association itself.

\$2,500 for dental equipment and the Mesa Emergency Child Health and Dental Fund which aids low-income families in providing dental services to youngsters who would not otherwise be able to have dental care.

\$500 for the purchase of 312 sheets for a civilian hospital in Saigon, South Viet Nam.

\$6,600 to the Peace Corps School Partnership Program for construction of schools and purchase of school materials in Brazil, Ecuador, Thailand, Philippines, Colombia, Costa Rica, and the Tonga Islands.

\$2,400 for the construction of a South American Aviary Exhibit at the Phoenix Zoo.

\$1,150 for desks, books, and other supplies for the Peace Corps school in Cartagena, Colombia where previously donated funds were used to construct the school building.

\$3,100 for the construction of a dining hall for the Easter Seal Crippled Children's Lodge.

The service project of 1972 was especially

effective. The student council decided to support the Easter Seal Camp for crippled children which is located approximately 150 miles north of Phoenix on the pine covered Mingus Mountain. The support of the entire student body (over 1300 students and faculty) involved in selling candy, flowers, pop-sicles, dill pickles plus an assortment of other items, and climaxed by a dance at the end of the ten-day project in February, realized \$4,600.

During the last weekend in April, 32 students and 14 adults journeyed to Easter Seal Camp to take part in a work project. Shingling the roof of a cabin, painting, and beginning the initial construction phase of a large dining and recreation facility was just a few of the different phases of the work project. Plenty of good food prepared by the students and lots of fun was enjoyed by everyone there. A roaring fire in the fireplace of the lodge provided the setting for an exciting evening of singing, skits, stories, jokes, and fun and laughter for all.

The students of Mesa Junior High are proud of their school and the opportunities of service that have been provided for them. The tremendous success of a program of this nature would not be possible without strong enthusiastic leadership of the student council and an equal amount of enthusiasm and wise direction provided by adult sponsors.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO COMBAT SHORELINE EROSION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. VANIK and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON) in introducing legislation designed to combat the growing problem of shoreline erosion.

Two recent studies by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have revealed the national magnitude of the problem. In 1969, the national streambank erosion study concluded that 549,000 of the country's 7,090,000 miles of stream channels were suffering erosion, with 148,000 of those miles experiencing erosion significant enough to warrant future study. The national shoreline study, which was completed in August of 1971, found that 20,500 miles or 25 percent of our ocean and Great Lakes shores are undergoing significant erosion, with 2,700 miles labeled critical by the corps.

The shoreline study indicates that about 70 percent of these critical areas are privately owned and thus not eligible for Federal assistance because the present law limits the corps to constructing emergency bank protection works for the protection of public property endangered by bank erosion.

The failure of the Federal law to provide assistance for private property has insured an artificial, fragmented approach which often does more harm than good. When a private property owner tries to buttress up his own land, his effort may result in more damage to the surrounding unprotected property and, at best, provide only temporary relief for his own land. Similarly, when the corps shores up publicly owned property, its

efforts often endanger the surrounding privately owned property.

On the other hand, if the landowner does nothing, he may have a front row seat to watch his home gradually slip into the water.

In Maumee, Ohio, where the corps labeled the erosion significant enough to warrant further study, homeowners are living on borrowed time as their houses inch ever closer to the Maumee River. One property owner graphically described the problems of the area to me in a recent letter:

Our homes and land have been slipping gradually toward the river, due to layers of silt and consequent veins of water lying up to 80 feet under the town of Maumee, Ohio. For example, the Lucas County Library itself is in danger of collapsing in the not-too-distant future.

... the natural flow of these veins of water is toward the (Maumee) river and our homes are in its wake, so actually the drain off of the town is responsible for the slippage and erosion on our land.

Personally, we built a \$5000 terrace on our home toward the river and half of it has sunk 24 inches and is still moving. The terrain all along this area appears as a huge crust of the earth that has broken away. Many of our poor neighbors are having more damage than we are experiencing; near Judge Alexander's home it has dropped 5 to 6 feet.

Mr. Speaker, this same scenario is repeated time and again across the country and the amount of damage runs into the millions each year. While our present law discriminates between erosion on publicly owned property and that on privately owned property, I am afraid that erosion itself does not discriminate and it is time we recognized that the public interest extends to both kinds of property. As the national shoreline study concluded—

Much of the shoreline that is undergoing critical erosion is in private hands, and erosion on such lands is increasing. Erosion is increasing for publicly owned lands also, but necessary remedial action can be taken through public institutions whereas the public has limited voice in the management of privately held lands. Yet the public interest in such private shores is considerable. The management of private lands often affects public beaches, navigation channels, and other facilities. Ecological and environmental problems are not stopped by private fences, nor are the problems associated with storm flooding and disaster-related emergencies. Private as well as public lands need to be considered in shoreline and coastal zone planning in order to reflect the total public interest.

In the light of these findings, it is not surprising that the study's first recommendation was for "coordinated action by Federal, State, and local governments in concert with action by corporate and private owners to arrest erosion of the national shorelines."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that only a combination of private and public action can curb the problem. The Federal Government, acting through the Army Corps of Engineers, must coordinate the placement of abutments, retaining walls, jetties, and such other measures as may be necessary to prevent erosion from destroying productive lands, both public

and private, and from contaminating our waterways with large amounts of silt and sediment.

The private landowner whose property is benefited, for his part, must be required to pay his fair share of the cost.

The legislation that we are introducing today seeks to effectuate a national program to abate shoreline erosion by allowing private property owners to qualify for assistance from the Corps of Engineers in accordance with already established procedures for civil projects to abate shore erosion on public lands. The bill would permit the Federal matching grant formula of 50-to-50 reimbursement to be met by responsible local interests. In this manner, private citizens, through the process of special municipal assessments, would be able to match Federal aid to solve a problem whose effects are of national importance.

Mr. Speaker, the present situation can only worsen unless we authorize preventive measures immediately. I urge the House Committee on Public Works to act promptly on this measure.

THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the 92d Congress was passage of a law that has far-reaching importance for all American consumers, and for virtually every U.S. industry—the Consumer Product Safety Act.

Exactly 1 month after the act was signed into law, I made an address about the principles that will lead to effective operation of a Federal consumer safety program.

The address was delivered in Washington November 27 at a briefing conference conducted by the first publication to focus exclusively on this new regulatory area—Product Safety Letter—and I would like to call my colleagues' attention to its background.

In any regulatory process, there is need for a reliable communications channel between Government and the affected industries. Product Safety Letter, edited and published by veteran Washington newsman, David Swit, supplies just that information source.

Since early 1972, this independent newsletter has provided objective reports and penetrating analysis of congressional and regulatory developments in product safety. On the legislative scene, Product Safety Letter accurately forecast in its very first issue—and repeatedly for 6 months thereafter—that the House product safety bill would provide the basis for this landmark law.

In regulatory news, this weekly publication's many exclusive articles read like a litany of the products that the new act affects. Topics have included flammable

fabrics, banned toys, inspection of detergent manufacturers, retailers' roles in repurchase plans, safety glazing, lead-containing paints, dangerous food cans, aerosols, safety closures, jointer-planers, power mower standards, kitchen range designs, problems with advertising, and Federal pre-emption.

The users and makers of these and hundreds of other products, many of them long unregulated, will feel the impact of the statute which I discuss, and I insert my address to the Product Safety Letter Briefing Conference in the RECORD.

The address follows:

BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

(By Representative BOB ECKHARDT)

It has been said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. This evening as we met to consider the future of the consumer product safety act I think it is essential that we remember past federal consumer safety efforts. Perhaps then the consumer product safety commission can improve on them and make a reality the right to safety enunciated by John F. Kennedy ten long years ago.

It is particularly important that we also inquire into appropriate goals for the consumer product safety commission; not merely because of our hope that the commission will justify the faith that Congress and the public have placed in it; but because of our belief that federal regulatory efforts simply cannot afford failure.

Unfortunately, it is obvious that the American public is going through a crisis of confidence in government. For example, a recent study at Ohio State University found that the American people's trust in their government dropped nearly 20% between 1964 and 1970; and public trust among blacks dropped at approximately twice that rate. Thus in 1964 25% of the persons polled mistrusted government, but by 1970 the figure had risen to 39%.

Loss of public confidence in government is not a good development for consumers or for business. Such attitudes threaten the very fabric of our republic. Nor is there any governmental function that is more fundamental and necessary than protection of the public safety. In other words, if we cannot cut it in the safety area, we are bad shape.

What then, are the principles that will lead to the effective operation of a Federal Consumer Safety Program? Let us consider them in light of the new law and some experiences of the past.

First, an effective program requires an adequate statute. As noted by the National Commission on product safety "In the past government has responded to specific safety crises by enacting piecemeal, limited and disparate legislation . . . legislation for a single hazard often fails to cover other serious associated hazards. The original flammable fabrics act did not touch flammable hats, gloves, footwear, draperies, bedding, upholstering or carpeting. The radiation control for health and safety act authorized inspection of television sets for radiation but not fire hazards."

Congress has sought to avoid this piecemeal approach to Federal safety legislation by giving the consumer product safety commission comprehensive jurisdiction over all consumer products which are not covered by other laws.

A well-drafted statute also gives the administering agency flexibility in approaching a particular regulatory problem. Again the Congress has attempted to delegate to the consumer product safety commission a broad spectrum of powers with which it can approach the job of reducing consumer prod-

uct hazards. The powers include: standard setting, investigation, research, banning, recall and injunction.

A good statute requires adequate sanctions. In this area under the consumer product safety act a knowing violation of a Federal safety standard may result in civil penalties of up to \$500,000 for a related series of violations, with each non-conforming product amounting to a separate violation. Criminal penalties are also provided under the act for knowing and willful violations, after notice from the commission.

On the other hand, a well-drafted statute insures fair procedures to all those subject to its terms. Both the House and Senate Commerce Committees expended considerable effort to insure that the procedures were fair to all concerned. For example, all product safety standards and product bans, must be issued after a hearing pursuant to section 553 of title 5. In addition to the requirements of that section the bill requires the commission to afford interested parties an opportunity for oral presentation of arguments and requires that a transcript be kept.

Court review of a product safety standard or ban is pursuant to the "substantial evidence" rule rather than the usual rule which sustains agency's action if it is neither arbitrary nor capricious. This is a major departure from the normal standard of court review. There are numerous other examples. The point is that this agency has the tools to function effectively and fairly, if it will use them.

Second, the Federal Agency with responsibility must be free to use its powers in accord with its own best judgment. Congress has placed the responsibility for product safety activities in the five-member consumer product safety commission. It has given the commissioners seven-year staggered terms and directed that they may be removed only for neglect of duty or malfeasance, but for no other cause. In this manner it has created a truly independent regulatory commission to administer the law. In the past certain officials of the administration have apparently attempted to control the decisions of Federal agencies operating in the field of consumer protection and environmental quality through a process of preclearance of standards through the Office of Management and Budget.

Certain Federal agencies were required to submit an advance schedule showing estimated dates of all proposed and final regulations, standards and guidelines, the name of the agency official responsible for the activity, and the proposed regulations, standards or guidelines, in advance of their announcement to the public.

The consumer product safety commission is not structured so as to come within the scope of such a requirement. While it may well decide to coordinate its activities with other Federal programs, it is not subject to any requirement of prior clearance of its consumer safety activities and should not submit to such outside control.

*Third, the leadership of a Federal regulatory program must not fear to use the powers given to it by Congress.

In this connection, it is my clear recollection that when Congress enacted the Federal Hazardous Substances Act it provided in section 2(q) (2) that if the Secretary finds that distribution for household use of a hazardous substance presents an imminent hazard to the public health he may by order determine that such substance is a "banned hazardous substance" pending completion of a full administrative proceeding under the act. Now, the food and drug administration has had that authority from 1966 until 1972. During that period of time the National Commission on Product Safety submitted its final report to the President and Congress enumerating at least 16 household

products, including dishwasher detergents and petroleum-based furniture polish, which it determined were unreasonably hazardous. Yet the FDA took no action under this section. During the same period the FDA itself commenced a regulatory proceeding against carbon tetrachloride which it determined should be banned from the marketplace. Yet, although the proceeding lasted in excess of two years, the FDA at no time sought to declare carbon tetrachloride an imminent hazard.

The Consumer Product Safety Act gives the new Commission the authority to control imminent hazards through court actions. It permits the court to permanently or temporarily recall, ban or otherwise regulate a hazard which poses an imminent and unreasonable risk of severe personal injury or death. It is to be hoped the Commission will learn from the past and judiciously use the powers Congress has given it.

But if it does not, the act authorizes any member of the public, including a consumer, to petition the agency to commence proceeding for a consumer product safety rule. If the commission denies the petition, the petitioner may commence a civil action in the United States District Court to compel the commission to initiate such a proceeding. If the petitioner can demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the consumer product presents an unreasonable risk of injury and that the failure of the commission to initiate a proceeding unreasonably exposes the petitioner or other consumers to such a risk of injury, the court may order the commission to initiate the proceeding requested.

In short it is to be hoped that the failure to utilize delegated powers which has been so apparent in the past will not be repeated in the new consumer product safety commission.

Fourth, a Federal agency must avoid becoming overly close to, and being overly influenced by, those which it has the responsibility of overseeing.

There have been numerous instances of such an overly close relationship in the past. For example, the FDA has been in the habit of making certain regulatory decisions after *ex parte* meetings with manufacturers of the products involved. These meetings were not announced to the public in advance. No representatives of the public are present when these decisions are reached. For example, in August and October of 1972 the FDA granted extensions of its safety packaging regulation for prescription drugs. These extensions were apparently made after discussions with industry representatives. Why they were not made after a public hearing or at minimum an opening meeting is difficult to understand.

Other examples of an unnecessarily close relationship with industry include a meeting with manufacturers of plastic oven roasting bags announced one day after it had been completed, and the announcement of a series of meetings with bicycle manufacturers which was made after the meetings had been concluded. I do not suggest that there should be no communication between the regulatory agency and the industries it oversees. I do suggest that a consumer safety agency functions as a quasi judicial body and should act after public notice with representation from all interests when it makes a decision. It should do this as much to instill public confidence as to insure that its decisions are correct.

Another past practice which tends to undermine confidence is the use of the agency in its upper echelons as an escalator between public service and employment by the industry that it regulates.

For example, during the consideration of the Consumer Product Safety Act it was noted that one of the three senior officials of the Food and Drug Administration left his

job and immediately took a position with the food industry, which immediately prior had been subject to his regulatory authority. While this may not have been contrary to the letter of the Food, Drug, Cosmetic Act, it most certainly is contrary to its spirit. If a Federal agency is a training ground for corporate executives, how can its leaders be expected to exercise objective judgment in the public interest? Section 4(g)(2) of the Consumer Product Safety Act addresses itself to this fault. It precludes any employee above grade 14 from accepting employment or compensation from a manufacturer subject to the act for at least one year after terminating employment with the Commission.

Fifth, where Federal law is violated the responsible agency should move promptly and with vigor to prosecute the violators.

In the past this has not always been the case. For example, a study by the General Accounting Office in April 1972 found that of 97 food plants surveyed, about 40% were operating under unsanitary conditions. GAO found that the cause of these conditions was twofold: 1) FDA's limitation in resources to make inspections; and 2) FDA's lack of timely and aggressive enforcement action when poor sanitation conditions were found. GAO furnished the following example of inadequate FDA enforcement action. The respondent involved was a macaroni and noodle manufacturing plant with annual sales of about \$600,000, shipping 30% of its food in interstate commerce. FDA made eight inspections of this plant during a 46-month period ending October, 1971: Seven inspections revealed insect activity; one resulted in the plant's voluntarily destroying 14,000 pounds of insect infested spaghetti. All but one of the eight inspections revealed some degree of insect activity. In May of 1971 the inspection found live adult beetles and larvae in the manufacturing equipment. FDA officials advised GAO that no regulatory action was taken against this firm because evidence of contamination was not found in the sample collected after shipment in interstate commerce. An FDA official advised that in his opinion the plant was a "borderline case." GAO concluded that when a plant has repeatedly violated sanitation standards, FDA should use one of the more aggressive enforcement alternatives available to it rather than merely continue to reinspect the plant.

To that I say, "Amen."

Sixth, a Federal regulatory agency should anticipate new problems which it may encounter in administering the law. When it finds it has inadequate regulatory authority it should not hesitate to ask Congress for new authority.

In the past this has not been done. Again a General Accounting Office report, this one dated September 14, 1972, is relevant. The GAO studied the question of whether the lack of authority limits consumer protection by the FDA in identifying and removing from the market products which violate the law. It concluded that the FDA has had difficulty in removing defective products from the market because it lacks authority to: 1) Obtain access to records needed to identify violative products; 2) lacks authority to detain products from interstate shipment pending a determination of whether they should be removed from the market; and 3) lacks authority to require a mandatory recall to violative products.

GAO found that between 1969 and 1970, 3,300 firms refused to cooperate with requests by the FDA for inspection of records. It found that of 91 seizures, 69% of the total amount of products determined to violate the act were actually removed from the market the remaining 31% was apparently sold to the public. It found that in reviewing 106 voluntary recalls requested by the FDA in 1971 an average of fifteen days passed before the firm in question acted on the FDA's request. Thirty-eight percent of the products involved

were sold during the delay between FDA request and the response of the firm in question.

In each of these cases, there exists and has existed for some time a clear lack of adequate legislative authority on the part of the Food and Drug Administration. Yet as far as I know, no request for such authority has ever been made to Congress. In reviewing the conclusions of the GAO, the FDA stated on July 31, 1972, that it is currently giving "the most serious consideration" to a request for such new legislative authority. Serious consideration, is, in my view, long overdue. In this connection, I might point out that section 27k(2) of the Consumer Product Safety Act states that when the Commission reports to the President it shall concurrently transmit a copy to Congress. We need to restore the power of the Congress, the body which represents the people. No agency of the United States should have authority to require prior submission of legislative recommendations by the Commission. I am referring, of course, to the sweeping and near dictatorial powers that the Office of Management and Budget seems to have over other Federal agencies. Consumer Product Safety Act specifically states that Congress have the right to any documents prepared by the Commission at the same time such documents are submitted to OMB. In addition, OMB shall not have veto powers over Commission actions. Perhaps which such congressional guidance, the future of product safety regulation will be better in this regard.

To summarize, then, an effective consumer safety program requires a well written statute and an agency with the freedom to act, willing to use the powers delegated by Congress, which is not inordinately close to the industries which it is directed to regulate, which will move promptly and vigorously to enforce the law, which will anticipate regulatory problems and seek new legislative authority from the Congress when that is necessary.

In each of these areas, the Consumer Product Safety Act has been tailored to avoid the pitfalls of the past. With dedicated leadership and adequate resources, I am confident of a bright future for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and, more important, a safer environment for American consumers.

DRIVE FOR PEACE, SECURITY IN EAST CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, several groups, including the Polish-Hungarian World Federation and Affiliates led by the former Polish consul general, Dr. Karol H. Ripa of Chicago, and the American Hungarian Federation under the leadership of Bishop Zoltan Beky and Judge Albert A. Fiock have submitted memoranda to the President, the State Department, and others regarding the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe—CSCE—and the multilateral balanced force reductions—MBFR.

Both documents agree upon the necessity of peace and security to be attained through free political development of the nations of Europe, and look to a relaxation of present strained relations.

They propose, however, that just as the U.S.S.R. has raised the issue of an European charter, the United States also

should include on the agenda bold proposals including the neutralization of east-central Europe.

While the suggestion is couched in general terms, it is meant as a political and intellectual stimulus for our diplomats in the hope that their further study will result in solidification of the issue of neutralization in a manner presentable to an international conference.

It is perhaps appropriate to note here that the Polish-Hungarian World Federation not only has the support of most major Polish and Hungarian American organizations, but also of many national organizations of American Bulgarians, Albanians, and Croats, who are very sympathetic to the common cause.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include both the text of the resolution of the Polish-Hungarian World Federation adopted by its board of directors on November 26, 1972, and the resolution adopted by the American Hungarian Federation:

RESOLUTION ON A NEW CENTRAL EUROPE, ADOPTED NOVEMBER 26, 1972, BY THE POLISH-HUNGARIAN WORLD FEDERATION

The cardinal motivation of nationhood is self-determination. No nation will seek foreign domination by choice. These well established truisms are fully punctuated in the pages of history throughout the ages. Because collective man has generally been the aggressor, the strong seeking to subdue the weak, wars have been the means by which strong nations have subdued weak nations.

Power is neither absolute nor permanent. The strong of one day may become the weak of another. So nations have risen in power and influence only to be subdued by other nations who themselves then became subdued and conquered. History is replete with cogent testimony to these realities.

War as a form of conquest for economic gain is no longer workable. What may have been true years ago when the spoils went to the victor, today there are no victors in war. All participants are losers. Wars, therefore, as a form of national policy is no longer a viable political instrument. Nations must now look to more profound areas of negotiation with the various peoples of the world to achieve world peace.

Of late a movement has been afoot to neutralize, militarily, Central and Eastern Europe. This goal is not only socially and economically desirable, but would prove politically sound as it would stabilize a whole area of political discontent. The proposal is to reach an internationally guaranteed agreement for the neutralization of a zone between Germany and Russia.

Considering that the two world wars broke out in the central European area, between Russia and Germany, it would behoove the great powers to take cognizance of these realities and look with favor toward achieving these goals. It is well known that the people in the nations between Germany and Russia are discontented. So long as there is discontent, the danger of another war is ever present.

Poland has had a long and stormy history. The boundaries of this country have frequently fluctuated. It has been occupied by many peoples, in the present century by the Germans and the Russians. But no matter who occupies Poland, the Polish people have retained their traditions of fierce independence.

The Pole is a passionate idealist who takes pride in his patriotism. This pride in nationalism is finely expressed in the song of the emigre Polish soldiers in Napoleon's armies: "Poland is not yet dead while we still live."

From the time of Stephen I to the present,

the aim of the Hungarian people has been to mold a free and independent nation. This struggle has been going on for a thousand years. The last great surge for freedom took place in 1956, when the Hungarian people attempted to free themselves from Soviet oppression.

What holds true for the patriotism of the Polish and Hungarian people holds true for the other peoples in Central and Eastern Europe.

The POLISH-HUNGARIAN WORLD FEDERATION AND AFFILIATES, therefore, resolves to support the goals and aims toward achieving a neutralized Central and Eastern Europe and calls upon the Government of the United States and the Governments of Europe to consider the proper course of action for the fulfillment of these aims.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN-HUNGARIAN FEDERATION, ADOPTED NOVEMBER 4, 1972

The American-Hungarian Federation is addressing the President of the United States about the suggestions of the American-Hungarian community and its needs as follows:

1. At the MBFR talks priority should be awarded to the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary without, however, interfering unfavorably with the security interests of NATO.

2. As the small states living in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear superpower, i.e., the U.S.S.R., would even then remain in a defenseless position, Hungary and other countries of East Central Europe should be neutralized in accordance with the Austrian pattern, and their neutral status should be guaranteed by the major powers and the United Nations.

3. The principles agreed upon in the Moscow Agreements of 1972 i.e., "noninterference with domestic affairs, sovereign equality, independence, abstention from the use or the threat of force" were not kept in the past and therefore, they can only be applied in the future to such state of affairs in which they have already become realities.

4. The American-Hungarian Federation does not recognize the final permanence of European frontiers.

5. The common goal: normalization of life, general security and cooperation may not be attained without a replacement of present constraints by respect for human rights and civil liberties, free communications, mutual and free cultural relations and religious and press freedoms. These liberties should also extend to the national minorities of the various European states.

VIETNAM—THEN AND NOW

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the confusing, cautious, and conflicting statements by this administration and past administrations on the Vietnam war have been dramatically summarized by the Washington Post in an "instant editorial." Last week I asked Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which of these statements would be true today, but he did not choose one, preferring to rest with the view that South Vietnam would defeat North Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to read this "instant editorial" and to support my efforts

to discharge my bill to cut off funds for continuation of this war. I have announced plans to circulate a discharge petition as soon as the bill is referred to a committee so that we can vote to stop the bombing and withdraw all troops within 30 days pending release of prisoners and a full accounting for those missing in action.

I insert at this point the editorial from the December 31, 1972, Washington Post entitled "The Story of Vietnam: An Instant Editorial."

THE STORY OF VIETNAM: AN INSTANT EDITORIAL

"I fully expect [only] six more months of hard fighting."—General Navarre, French Commander-in-Chief, Jan. 2, 1954.

"With a little more training the Vietnamese Army will be the equal of any other army..."—Secretary of the Army Wilbur Brucker, Dec. 18, 1955.

"The American aid program in Vietnam has proved an enormous success—one of the major victories of American policy."—Gen. J. W. O'Daniel, Official Military Aide to Vietnam, Jan. 8, 1961.

"Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war... U.S. aid to Vietnam has reached a peak and will start to level off."—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, 1962.

"The South Vietnamese should achieve victory in three years... I am confident the Vietnamese are going to win the war. [The Vietcong] face inevitable defeat."—Adm. Harry D. Felt, U.S. Commander-in-Chief of Pacific Forces, Jan. 12, 1963.

"The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in South Vietnam."—Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, March 8, 1963.

"The South Vietnamese themselves are fighting their own battle, fighting well."—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, April, 1963.

"South Vietnam is on its way to victory."—Frederick E. Nolting, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, June 12, 1963.

"I feel we shall achieve victory in 1964."—Tram Van Dong, South Vietnamese general, Oct. 1, 1963.

"Secretary McNamara and General [Maxwell] Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."—White House statement, Oct. 2, 1963.

"Victory... is just months away, and the reduction of American advisers can begin any time now. I can safely say the end of the war is in sight."—Gen. Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, Oct. 31, 1963.

"I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight. I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them."—Secretary McNamara, Feb. 3, 1964.

"The United States still hopes to withdraw its troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1965."—Secretary McNamara, Feb. 19, 1964.

"The Vietnamese... themselves can handle this problem primarily with their own effort."—Secretary Rusk, Feb. 24, 1964.

"We are not about to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."—President Lyndon Johnson, Oct. 21, 1964.

"We have stopped losing the war."—Secretary McNamara, October 1965.

"I expect... the war to achieve very sensational results in 1967."—Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, Jan. 9, 1967.

"We have succeeded in attaining our objectives."—Gen. William Westmoreland, U.S. field commander in Vietnam, July 13, 1967.

"We have reached an important point when the end begins to come into view... the

enemy's hopes are bankrupt." Gen. Westmoreland, Nov. 21, 1967.

"We have never been in a better relative position."—Gen. Westmoreland, April 10, 1968.

"[the enemy's] situation is deteriorating rather rapidly."—Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, White House aide, January 1969.

"We have certainly turned the corner in the war."—Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, July 23, 1969.

"I will say confidently that looking ahead just three years, this war will be over. It will be over on a basis which will promote lasting peace in the Pacific."—President Richard Nixon, Oct. 12, 1969.

"This action [the invasion of Cambodia] is a decisive move."—President Richard Nixon, "General Abrams tells me that in both Laos and Cambodia his evaluation after three weeks of fighting is that—to use his terms—the South Vietnamese can hack it, and they can give an even better account of themselves than the North Vietnamese units. This means that our withdrawal program, our Vietnamization program, is a success . . ."—President Richard Nixon, March 4, 1971.

"Peace is at hand."—Dr. Henry Kissinger, Oct. 26, 1972.

"We have agreed on the major principles that I laid down in my speech to the nation of May 8. We have agreed that there will be a ceasefire, we have agreed that our prisoners of war will be returned and that the missing in action will be accounted for, and we have agreed that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right to determine their own future without having a Communist government or a coalition government imposed upon them against their will.

"There are still some details that I am insisting be worked out and nailed down because I want this not to be a temporary peace. I want, and I know you want it—to be a lasting peace. But I can say to you with complete confidence tonight that we will soon reach agreement on all the issues and bring this long and difficult war to an end."—President Nixon, Nov. 6, 1972.

"The United States and North Vietnam are locked in a 'fundamental' impasse over whether they are negotiating an 'armistice' or 'peace,' Henry A. Kissinger acknowledged yesterday."—From *The Washington Post*, Dec. 17, 1972.

"Waves of American warplanes, including a record number of almost 100 B-52 heavy bombers, pounded North Vietnam's heartland around Hanoi and Haiphong yesterday and today in the heaviest air raids of the Vietnam War."—From *The Washington Post*, Dec. 20, 1972.

"Hundreds of U.S. fighter-bombers launched intensified attacks yesterday on North Vietnamese air defense sites in an all-out attempt to cut down the number of B-52 heavy bombers and their 6-man crews being shot down by surface-to-air missiles."—From *The Washington Post*, Dec. 30, 1972.

"The President has asked me to announce that negotiations between Dr. Kissinger and special advise Le Duc Tho and Minister Xuan Thuy will be resumed in Paris on Jan. 8. Technical talks between the experts will be resumed Jan. 2 . . . The President has ordered all bombing will be discontinued above the 20th parallel as long as serious negotiations are under way."—Gerald L. Warren, White House spokesman, Dec. 30, 1972.

GARLAND C. LADD

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the contribution of a long-

time friend, Garland C. Ladd, a pioneer in public education on nuclear power, who today ends a 31 year career with North American Rockwell—NR—via early retirement. He is 55.

Mr. Ladd retires as director of public relations for Atomics International—AI—in Canoga Park, Calif., a post he has held since that NR Division was established in 1955.

Associated with atomic energy development since the company entered the field shortly after World War II, he was a pioneer in the development of information programs to aid public understanding and acceptance of the use of nuclear power to generate electricity. His efforts embraced reactors of a variety of types and sizes developed and built by AI during the infancy of nuclear power and, in more recent years, the fast breeder reactor.

As AI's PR director, he has guided a flow of information about the company's activities and products through news releases, exhibits, publications, motion pictures, advertising, interviews with company officials, assisting writers with feature articles, photos, and material for corporate reports to shareholders.

During his years in the post, he acquired numerous friends in the atomic energy field, including Atomic Energy Commission officials, utility company management personnel, members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and among journalists.

Ladd has served on a number of State and national public information committees, developing information programs on peaceful uses of the atom.

During many years as chairman and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I was most impressed with Mr. Ladd's contribution to nuclear public information. I am pleased to note that his work has drawn favorable attention and comment from other leaders in the nuclear field, including former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss and Glenn Seaborg.

He began his career with NR in November 1941 when he joined the Production Control Department of what was then North American Aviation, Inc., in Inglewood. Within a few months, he transferred to public relations, where he was assigned to general news. Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, he had applied for a Navy commission. He became an ensign and, in 1942, went on active duty with the Bureau of Aeronautics. He produced motion pictures for the Bureau, served on various types of naval vessels in both Atlantic and Pacific areas and advanced to the rank of lieutenant.

Ladd returned to NR in late 1946 and, during the next few years, produced and distributed news copy, photos, and information material on such aircraft as the Navion private plane, the F-82 Twin Mustang, B-45 Tornado jet bomber, F-86 Sabre, T-28 trainer, and the carrier-based AJ-1 Savage and FJ-1 Fury.

He originated the corporate documentary movie program by producing the first NAA film made specifically for public showing. The feature, called "Special Showing of Latest Aircraft," was an early TV favorite.

In 1951, he took charge of public relations activities for the aerophysics pro-

gram in Downey, a program that led to establishment of the AI, Rocketdyne, Autonetics and Space Divisions. In October 1955, Ladd and Lee Atwood, former president of NR, chose the name Atomics International for the newly established division.

Prior to joining NR, Ladd was associated with the Walt Disney Studios where, as an assistant director, he worked on Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck shorts, then on such features as "Pinocchio," "Bambi," "Fantasia," "Dumbo," and "The Reluctant Dragon."

He is a graduate of the University of Southern California where he received his bachelor's degree in 1939.

CONSTITUTIONS OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to a work which our own Library of Congress has described as "a notable addition to the reference collection." This 12-volume work is unique in providing us with an English translation—plus commentary and bibliography—of the constitution of every country in the world.

Appropriately entitled "Constitutions of the Countries of the World," this set is edited by Albert P. Blaustein and Gilbert H. Flanz. The publisher is Oceana Press in Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. Volume 1 was published last year, volume 6 has just made its appearance, and volume 12 will undoubtedly complete the set in 1974.

It is particularly appropriate to mention this work as all of us get ready for our Nation's bicentennial. It is particularly useful to have on hand all of the constitutions of the world so that we may judge the influence of our then infant democracy upon the nations which later came into being. It is instructive to see how many constitutions of the world have been based upon or have borrowed from our own.

But perhaps even more important is the lesson that we learn from Blaustein and Flanz in their commentaries on these constitutions. For it may even be more instructive for us to see how these constitutions differ from ours. Remember, we have one of the very oldest constitutions in the world.

And as other countries have developed their own particular constitutions for their own particular needs, they have learned from our errors as well as from our accomplishments. It should be a continuing task of all of us in Congress to examine the constitutions of other countries—with a goal of making ours that much more functional and effective.

"Constitutions of the Countries of the World" was chosen for the principal book review in the November 15, 1972, issue of *The Booklist*—published by the American Library Association. Here, in a most favorable review, is the following explanation of the makeup of this set:

Designed for a loose-leaf set, constitutions (with commentary and bibliography) are

issued individually on good heavy paper, spine-edge stapled. They are punched for easy insertion in the very well-constructed post and plate binder, which has a large and clear spine title. Arrangement of each issue can be made according to the subscriber's own plan (e.g., alphabetically, by continent, etc.).

Using this format, the editors will be able to provide a continually up-to-date collection of texts and commentaries. And, as pointed out by the American Library Association, there is no comparable publication. This is revealed in the following words from the review:

The significance of recency in the publication of constitutions can hardly be over-emphasized, for during the past decade there has been widespread and comprehensive re-drafting of constitutions. The process continues currently and gives indication of persisting in the foreseeable future. When compared with the third revised edition of the well-known *Constitutions of Nations* edited by the Peaslees (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1965-), this set demonstrates such changes quite dramatically. The current Peaslee edition appeared in the mid-1960s during a time of great change in constitutions throughout the world. The constitution of Yugoslavia, to select an example, appears in its 1963 version in Peaslee. This constitution, drastically revised in 1967, is presented in its current form with the appropriate analytical commentary in *CCW*. The revisions were far more than technical or legalistic: basic reforms which in effect reallocated much of the power previously held by the Communist Party were introduced. Anyone referring to the 1963 edition would be quite seriously misled in using it to interpret or understand present-day Yugoslavia.

Perhaps the constitutions of "emerging" nations alone would justify the need for current publication. Those for both the Congo (Brazzaville) and the Congo (Kinshasa) are not up to date in Peaslee, but do appear in current form in *CCW*; this is particularly important in that the old "Leopoldville" constitution was drastically revised in 1967 for "Kinshasa." (To clarify terminology about the Congos somewhat, it is worth noting that on October 27, 1971 a presidential decree changed the name of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kinshasa) to the Republic of Zaïre.) In Peaslee's African volume the constitution for Malawi is out of date and that for Gambia does not appear at all; both are in *CCW*.

The author-editors have distinguished records in the fields of law and constitutional development. Professor Blaustein, a member of the Rutgers Law School faculty, is aptly described by the American Library Association as "a distinguished lawyer, journalist, teacher and law librarian with an extensive record of both scholarly and popular publications." He has worked on constitutional and legal problems and law-school development throughout the world—at the behest of the United States and foreign government, private law firms, the International Legal Center, The Asia Foundation, and the Institute of International Education. His travels and duties have taken him to Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Vietnam, Zaïre, and Zambia.

Gisbert Flanz is professor of Political Theory and Comparative Politics at New York University. He has likewise served as a consultant and adviser to our own

and foreign governments. He was an adviser to the Constitution Deliberation Committee of the Republic of Korea. The two editors met in connection with various efforts on constitutional and legal development in Vietnam.

GROWING SUPER STEEL PLAYS LEADING ROLE WITHIN INDUSTRY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a former member of my combat command during World War II recently associated himself with Super Steel Products Corp. in Milwaukee, Wis. I recently had an opportunity to visit with him here in Washington and he told me of the many new innovations which his company was undertaking in the steel fabrication industry.

He has just forwarded me a copy of the December 18, 1972, edition of the Milwaukee Sentinel which carries an article relative to his company describing the new computer system which they have installed in an effort to find ways to increase the efficiency and productivity of their manufacturing operation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article relating to this company:

GROWING SUPER STEEL PLAYS LEADING ROLE (By Roger A. Stafford)

Super Steel Products Corp., the rapidly growing Milwaukee firm which last week obtained the first city industrial revenue bonding, has been in the vanguard of its industry before.

"The world is full of tin knockers," says Super Steel President Fred G. Luber, describing the metal fabricating industry.

But, he added in an interview, it is not full of "tin knockers" with:

A profit sharing plan.
A completely portable, company paid pension plan.

A highly automated operation, now turning to a computer to further increase productivity.

A prime contract to furnish all new General Motors Corp. dealer signs.

And he might have added that the world is not full of metal fabricators whose sales have grown from \$200,000 in 1966 to \$3.2 million in the fiscal year ended July 31.

FOUNDED IN 1923

Super Steel has been on the Milwaukee industrial scene since 1923, but its modern history began with a change of ownership in 1966.

In that year Walter A. Belau sold his metal fabricating company at 1244 N. 4th St. to Luber and Joseph A. Downey, two engineers formerly with the Louis Allis Co.

The two men began with 18 employees in a plant that was in the path of the Park Freeway. They soon moved to a former Pepsi-Cola plant at 2800 W. Capitol Dr., renovating the structure which now serves as corporate headquarters.

"When we started we were just a service company for local industry," says Luber, noting that the company was "not too well tooled" and definitely in need of improved quarters.

TEAM CONCEPT

But after the move the two men began building the operation, instituting a labor-management team approach which Luber believes has been the key to the company's success.

Seeking to create a "proper environment" for their team approach, the Super Steel executives asked John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. to design a complete employee benefit package.

Included in the benefit package are profit sharing and an unusual company paid pension plan, which Luber uses to illustrate the firm's desire to create a good manufacturing environment.

Other pension plans, contends Luber, are frequently used by companies to keep employees from shifting jobs or by unions to insure membership. Contributions by employer or union cannot be taken out if a worker goes elsewhere.

Unlike those programs, Super Steel's plan is totally company paid and totally portable—the employee can take his accumulated sum with him, even if he leaves before retirement.

FREEDOM INVOLVED

From an expense point of view, Luber admits there was "no need for the pension program." But, he stresses, the freedom it involved was an essential part of the environment the company sought in its effort to improve productivity.

Luber says that under the team approach as practiced at Super Steel "antagonistic labor-management relations" do not exist and "there is no need for work rules" which could reduce productivity.

Employees, who formerly had a closed union shop, have established an open shop with about 40% of 150 workers unionized.

In addition to returning company profits to employees through various programs, the firm has spent large amounts on improved equipment.

NEW EQUIPMENT

Warner & Swasey tape operated punch presses make the firm "one of the most sophisticated" in the area as well as one of the largest, according to Luber.

The company is using a computer to analyze the tapes of the automatic equipment in an effort to further increase the efficiency and productivity of the operation.

Super Steel's growth accelerated three years ago when it became the major subcontractor in GM's program to equip all its dealerships in the US and Canada with new signs.

Last February Super Steel became the prime contractor in the GM program, taking over from A. O. Smith Corp. While the task of co-ordinating the program is a major one, Luber notes that having GM as a customer "gives us a credibility."

He finds other customers now saying to themselves, "If they're good enough for GM, they're good enough for us."

As the firm's business grew, so did its marketing area. The once local operation now does 75% of its business in other states and two-thirds of the remainder outside Milwaukee County.

Super Steel currently produces parts for GM's locomotive manufacturing plant in Illinois, does extensive work for machine tool and electrical manufacturers, and continues to serve all basic industries in the area.

NEW PRODUCT

Earlier this year the firm acquired its first proprietary line. After producing steel grain bins six years for Lindsay Brothers, Super Steel acquired all rights to manufacture and sell Lindsay's line of grain handling and storage systems.

Although the new product is a minor part of the operation, Luber believes it has great

potential. It fits in with the trend toward farmers drying their grain on their farm, rather than at central locations, he notes.

Super Steel plans to equip and service the grain bins for the farmers so that they do not have to do the work piecemeal as in the past, says Lubber.

The acquisition of the new line and the overall growth of the company resulted in the demand for increased manufacturing space.

Super Steel has added to its Capitol Dr. plant twice since 1966 and now operates a second plant just north of the headquarters. The firm has 100,000 square feet of manufacturing space in its two plants.

Earlier this year when the firm made its decision to add a new manufacturing facility it first looked out of state and out of the Milwaukee area.

"But we found we were following other companies for no reason," says Lubber. There is no denying the tax advantages elsewhere, Lubber indicates, but he believes that eventually "there will be tax equity" in the nation.

Eventually the firm worked out a \$350,000 industrial revenue bond program with the Department of City Development, enabling it to build a 25,000 square foot facility on a 10 acre parcel of city land at N. 77th St. and W. Tower Ave.

Lubber stresses that the ability to sell the tax free bonds at a reasonable interest and to spread repayment over 15 years was important, but still represented a more costly alternative than moving out of the area.

"DESIRE" CITED

In the end, contends the Super Steel executive, the firm had to have a desire to stay in the area and to improve the industrial climate by doing so. "It's easy to run," says Lubber, adding that he and his associate chose instead to honor what they view as an obligation to the Milwaukee area.

He illustrates his point by saying that not only did Super Steel play a major part in formulating the proposal for revenue bonding, but it also paid all the costs involved and arranged for the purchase of the bonds, most by First Wisconsin National Bank of Milwaukee.

The city in its first revenue bonding effort thus served as a conduit through which tax free status could be obtained, says Lubber. A spokesman for the First Wisconsin notes that the credit rating of Super Steel was the other major element considered.

As viewed by Lubber, industrial revenue bonding is a "little step in the right direction" of improving the industrial climate of the area.

EXPANSION SET

Super Steel plans further steps on its own, once the Northwest Side facility is completed early next year. Expansion of the 25,000 square foot building already is scheduled to begin before the end of 1973.

Within seven or eight years Lubber says the facility will be expanded to a 200,000 square foot operation with commensurate increases in employment.

His growth forecasts are substantiated by the firm's current sales which are expected to produce a \$5.5 million total for the 12 months ending next July 31.

The top three executives of Super Steel are Lubber, Downey and Larry E. Richardson. Downey is executive vice president and Richardson, another Louis Allis product, is vice president and also a part owner.

Completing the management team are John Mullaney, administrative vice president, and George Cobb, vice president of manufacturing. Both Cobb and Mullaney are former Louis Allis executives, too.

Lubber likes to stress that the firm's team approach to its operation has lowered barriers between management and employees so that hourly workers as well as executives

feel responsible for the success of the company.

And if its past record is any indication, Lubber's team appears unlikely to disappoint any of its backers—including the City of Milwaukee.

THE MIDWEST HAS BEEN LEFT OUT IN THE COLD

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of fuel is particularly critical in the Midwest, where temperatures have dropped to or below zero for several weeks. Many plants in western Illinois, an area I am proud to represent, have had to limit or completely shut down operations, because they simply cannot heat their facilities. Crops lie in snow-covered fields, or spoil in storage because the gas dryers have no fuel. At present, there are 1 billion bushels of corn and 250 billion bushels of soybeans still in the midwestern fields, and the snow and cold are expected to spoil the majority of the soybeans which have not been placed in bins. Major oil companies have cut back shipments of diesel fuel to railroads, trucking companies, barges, and bus lines which serve seven major cities. With the gas and oil reserves so dangerous low, a colder than normal February and March could be disastrous. I would like to take this opportunity to review the developments which have led to this energy crisis, and point out what steps I am taking to correct this situation.

Oil is our major source of energy, providing approximately 44 percent of our national needs. Demands for oil have continued to grow at an increasing rate. Yet, despite the lack of any Federal control over the price of crude oil, and despite several Federal tax and import provisions which encourage domestic exploration, the supply of domestic oil has been failing to meet demand in ever-larger margins.

The difference between the production from domestic wells and the domestic demand has been made up for years by imports of both crude oil and refined petroleum products. These imports are permitted under a complicated quota system which allots import "tickets" to domestic refiners to bring in oil to meet otherwise unsatisfied domestic need. Most observers expect the amount of imported oil to grow, because of the inadequacy of domestic supply and the soaring domestic demand. Some have even predicted that half of our oil supply will be imported within 15 years.

Unfortunately, in the past few months, the oil industry in the United States has been unable to eliminate the very real fears of an approaching energy crisis. The supply of oil is getting progressively tighter, and a real crunch is foreseen by 1974. I am particularly concerned about the Midwest—that section of the country which has been especially hard hit.

A few weeks ago I joined with 25 other Members of Congress in sending

a letter to Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton. This letter protested the unfair treatment of the Midwest under the current oil quota system and urged the Secretary to take necessary steps to rectify the shortage of fuel oil in that part of the country.

Although I was somewhat encouraged by the administration's decision to bring in 250 million additional gallons of No. 2 fuel oil for this winter heating season, I fear this action will be of the most benefit to the east coast—and of little benefit to the Midwest.

I was more encouraged by the administration's action yesterday to lift the import quotas on heating oils for the next 4 months and raising crude oil import quotas for the rest of the year by 65 percent. These moves will be of significant benefit to all sections of the country, and I am preparing a letter to the President commending his action and also urging that the steps he has taken become permanent ones.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all possible steps be taken at once to replenish heating oil, particularly in those sections of the country which have been most adversely affected. Therefore, in the next few days I will be introducing a bill which authorizes the President to ration fuels among civilian users until March 31, 1973. If such action is not now taken, the distress in the Midwest will become seriously worse. I will also introduce legislation to lift all important quotas on oil permanently.

The demand for natural gas has also been growing steadily. This is due in part to the extension of the pipeline systems, which became available to millions of new consumers. Primarily, however, it is due to the realization of the cleanliness of natural gas and its comparatively low price. Unanticipated desire for and requirements concerning clean air and low-pollutant emission eliminated many of the dirtier fuels for certain uses, at least without very expensive emission cleaning equipment, during the past few years. The relatively low price of gas per B.t.u. stimulated its use by all classes of consumers, including large industry and utility customers who burned gas lavishly under generator boilers. No estimates of natural gas demand were generous enough to predict the reality of present years, and, most unfortunately, several years are required between the decision to drill for gas and actual commercial production.

In 1954, the Supreme Court decided that producers of natural gas were part of the industry intended to be regulated as a natural monopoly under the Natural Gas Act for the protection of gas consumers. Despite much criticism by the producing industry of the decision, the Federal Power Commission still regulates the price of natural gas at the wellhead. Many are convinced that such regulation does not encourage the drilling of new wells, and thus is the major factor in the present shortage.

Although legislation will not have an immediate effect on the gas shortage, I will introduce a bill that will exempt from FPC regulation all natural gas produced after January 1 of this year. De-

regulation is a far-reaching proposal, and, in my opinion, is part and parcel of any reasonable effort to match demand with the supply.

Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is upon us. Given the seriousness and intensity of the situation, I urge the Congress to act immediately upon my proposals. The Midwest has been left out in the cold too long.

MIZELL COSPONSORS MEDICREDIT LEGISLATION

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to discuss with my colleagues a bill I have introduced today with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) and with other distinguished colleagues.

The legislation would establish a national health insurance program called medicredit, and it would give the assurance that no American family will have to suffer undue economic hardship as a result of illness and accompanying medical expenses.

It was my privilege to cosponsor this legislation 2 years ago with Mr. FULTON, and it has been a disappointment to me that final action has not yet been taken on this proposal.

As all of us in this Chamber know, we are faced with a crisis situation today in the area of medical care, and especially in terms of the spiraling costs of that care.

The legislation we are proposing today addresses itself to that crisis in what I believe to be a fair and effective way.

The legislation provides a sliding scale of Government assistance in paying for medical treatment, with the amount of assistance dependent on a client's ability to pay.

Under the provisions of this bill, the poor would receive free of charge a health insurance certificate which would provide them with medical care at no personal cost. The well-to-do would pay the full amount, and those in between would pay what they could reasonably be expected to afford.

I cannot conceive of a fairer approach to the growing crisis in health care we are experiencing today. And the most important feature of this legislation is the insurance that no American would have to bankrupt himself, because of a long-lasting, catastrophic illness.

We all know of instances in which lingering of severe illness has depleted a family's life savings, sometimes to the point that the family can no longer provide for its other needs, and becomes an unwilling burden on society.

This legislation can change all of that. For a family whose annual income is \$3,000 or less, practically any medical expense is more than they can afford, so catastrophic coverage for these families would begin without any prior payment by the individual.

A family making \$8,000 a year could

be expected to absorb up to \$500 in medical bills before qualifying, and a \$20,000 a year family would be expected to pay up to \$2,750 in medical bills before their Government coverage became operative.

I find this to be the most equitable system yet devised to make sure that every American can enjoy good health by being able to afford good health care.

This legislation represents not an approach toward a welfare state, but a realistic approach to our national goal of providing adequate health care for every American, no matter what his station in life.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in seeking passage of this legislation, and I would hope that the sense of urgency in which the bill is introduced will be reflected in the consideration it receives in this body.

OIL IMPORT CARGO PREFERENCE

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, during the second session of the 92d Congress, the Senate had occasion to debate the bill, H.R. 13324, authorizing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

This debate centered upon section 3 of that earlier bill which represented an amendment made by the Committee on Commerce and which would have required that at least 50 percent of "crude and unfinished oils and finished products, not including residual fuel oil to be used as fuel and No. 2 fuel oil," imported into the United States on a quota basis, be carried on higher-costing tanker vessels of the United States. This committee amendment was rejected by the Senate on July 26, 1972, on a record vote of 41 to 33.

Mr. President, in preparation for that earlier debate on the oil import cargo preference amendment to the bill, H.R. 13324, I corresponded with the several interested departments and agencies of the administration, all of which unanimously opposed this provision. One such exchange of correspondence was between myself and Secretary of Commerce Peterson which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 16, page 20629. In his response to me under date of June 12, 1972, Secretary of Commerce Peterson indicated that the administration at that time was evaluating various initiatives to bring into being and sustain an appropriate fleet level necessary to respond to changes which may arise in national security requirements from increases in oil imports. Mr. Peterson then went on to note that his Department expected to make its findings and recommendations on various initiatives in this area available to myself and to the interested committees of both Houses at a later date.

Since the report of the Department of

Commerce on this matter had not been forthcoming as of Friday of last week when Mr. Frederick B. Dent of South Carolina, the President's nominee to succeed Secretary of Commerce Peterson, appeared before our Commerce Committee, I questioned Mr. Dent as to when this report would be made available. Mr. Dent responded that it would be available to me at the beginning of this week.

Mr. President, Mr. Dent was true to his word and on Monday, January 15, I found awaiting me a letter from Secretary of Commerce Peterson dated January 12 responding to me on this matter. But, Mr. President, I must in all candor note to my colleagues that it is a response consisting of eight pages which says very little concerning the basic issue of new or significant initiatives to bring into being and sustain an appropriate U.S.-flag tanker fleet level necessary to respond to changes which may arise in national security requirements from increases in oil imports. Rather, it is a recitation of actions taken under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 and other related administrative actions taken by the Maritime Administration, leaving unanswered the question of our needs for oil imports, tanker tonnage and U.S.-flag tankers, pending a determination of a national energy policy.

Mr. President, in order that the record may be complete on this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Secretary of Commerce Peterson's letter of January 12 to me so that it will be available to all interested parties.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1973.

HON. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: In my letter of June 12th to you regarding the oil import cargo preference amendment to the maritime authorization bill, I indicated that the Department of Commerce was examining the need for new initiatives to achieve an adequate U.S. flag tanker fleet and would report to the interested Committees of Congress. This letter is in response to that commitment.

Due to the increasing domestic demand for oil, it is probable that more tanker tonnage will be required to meet national needs. The exact number and characteristics of these tankers depend upon many variables, such as the demand for petroleum, sources of supply, refinery sites, technological developments, port facilities, alternative energy sources and defense requirements. Moreover, these factors will be strongly influenced by our national energy policies. Most of the energy studies and forecasts made to date have been based upon the premise of no change in our national energy policy, and do not deal adequately, if at all, with the situation should there be changes in current policies.

Our energy situation is currently under intensive review by interested agencies in the Domestic Council in order to see what changes in national policy would be appropriate. In addition to maritime considerations, there are other extremely important factors to take into account, such as national security considerations and balance of payments factors. Until our national energy policy is determined, which will involve both the Executive Branch and the Congress, it is

impossible to predict with any assurance what our needs will be for oil imports, tanker tonnage, and United States flag tankers. The Department of Commerce is deeply involved in the overall energy studies now proceeding within the Executive Branch, and particularly in the maritime related aspects of these studies. Thus, although it would be premature at the present time to attempt to forecast with any certainty the total tanker needs of the United States, we should soon have a much better ability to answer this question.

Notwithstanding the on-going studies relating to oil import needs, the Department of Commerce has conducted a thorough review of whether existing legislation is adequate and effective within the context of the President's program to create a vital and competitive United States merchant marine. More specifically, we have dealt with the legislative areas which affect oil tankers. This review has convinced us that the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, calling for direct assistance to the maritime industry (as opposed to indirect measures such as cargo preference), provides the best conceptual and operational framework and tools yet proposed for the development and maintenance of a modern and competitive U.S. flag tanker fleet which will fulfill national needs at a cost which is not excessive to the United States consumer or taxpayer.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 extended for the first time to the bulk cargo carrying segment of the merchant fleet the full benefits of the construction and operating incentives of the 1936 Act, and contained other measures specifically designed to promote the bulk cargo segment. Since passage of the 1970 Act, the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce has devoted a major part of its efforts to the promotion of bulk cargo carriers, particularly tankers. These efforts are bearing fruit and have led to tangible results. Many of these results have occurred since my letter of June 12, 1972.

In the first 23 months following passage of the 1970 Act, the Maritime Administration executed contracts for the construction of 36 new ships and conversion of 13 existing vessels. These contracts represent a total investment in new and converted vessels for the U.S. merchant marine of nearly \$1.7 billion, the largest maritime shipbuilding commitment for a similar period of this Nation's peacetime history.

By comparison, in the 23 months immediately preceding enactment of the President's Maritime Program, total government assisted ship contracts and conversions amounted to only \$283 million (including \$123 million in containership conversions approved between June 1969 and October 1, 1970). The contrast is even greater when earlier years are considered. For example, during all of fiscal year 1967 only one construction contract representing a total investment of \$15.7 million was approved.

The figures for new ship construction under the President's maritime program include contracts for 18 new oil tankers (including two ore-bulk-oil carriers) with an aggregate carrying capacity of 2,145,900 deadweight tons and representing a total investment in excess of \$960 million. Thirteen of these tankers, representing in excess of \$545 million and having aggregate carrying capacity of 1,871,000 deadweight tons, have been contracted for by the Maritime Administration since my June 12 letter. We estimate that these 13 new tanker contracts will provide an aggregate of 15,300 man-years of employment in United States shipyards. These vessels will, of course, provide seagoing jobs for U.S. crews.

Contracts have also been signed since my June 12th letter for the construction of 6 liquefied natural gas (LNG) tankers with

an aggregate carrying capacity of 750,000 cubic meters of liquid gas. These contracts will generate at least 19,250 man-years of work over the next three years, and will give U.S. shipyards critical penetration into the worldwide market for LNG vessels.

Another development since my letter to you is the enactment of Section 2 of Public Law 92-402, approved by the President on August 22, 1972. This provision relaxes the foreign trading restrictions contained in Section 905(a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 with respect to bulk carriers built with construction subsidies.

In addition to these developments, the Commerce Department is working on ways to provide operating subsidy for domestic bulk carriers, in accordance with the authority granted in Section 603(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, to enable them to operate in the foreign trade. This provision, added as part of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, authorizes payment of sums determined "necessary to make the cost of operating such vessels competitive with the cost of operating similar vessels under the registry of a foreign country." The Department is utilizing this authority on an experimental basis in connection with the grain shipments to be made under the agreements recently concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union. Many of the vessels that will be employed in moving this grain are domestic tankers that might otherwise be laid up. We anticipate that this effort will provide an unprecedented opportunity to examine and test various incentives in the area of operating-differential subsidy, to determine which will be the most useful and effective. The experience we gain in this regard should be very helpful in determining whether to extend such subsidies to domestic tankers, some of which are not now fully employed, when they are engaged in the international trades.

As a result of these actions and the upswing in the world tanker market, the economic situation of U.S. flag tanker owners is considerably different today from what it was during the debates on oil import cargo preference. On April 3, 1972, the number of U.S. flag tankers in inactive status recorded by the Maritime Administration reached a record high. On that date, 43 tankers totaling 1,392,540 deadweight tons were laid up or otherwise inactive. The 43 ships had a total of 1,803 seagoing positions which, allowing for crew changes, provided employment for approximately 4,147 employees. By January 4, 1973, the inactive tanker list had dwindled to just seven ships, totaling 151,513 deadweight tons. The ships currently on the inactive list have a total of 288 seagoing positions and could provide employment for 662 seamen.

This dramatic reduction in the number of ships in lay-up was due initially to sharply rising charter rates for the movement of domestic oil. The extent of this change can be illustrated by the rates from the U.S. Gulf to the East Coast, north of Cape Hatteras. During the first week of April 1972, charter rates for this route averaged 11% below the standard American Tanker Rate Schedule (ATRS). During the last week of December, charter rates had climbed to 110% above the ATRS rate. Once the high winter demand for oil has been satisfied, many of the ships now carrying oil can be expected to enter the Russian grain trade under the operating subsidy system discussed above. Three ships that were in lay-up last Spring during the cargo preference debate have already come directly back into active service to participate in these Russian grain movements.

The U.S.-U.S.S.R. Maritime Agreement has begun to provide a very significant amount of employment for the U.S. flag tanker fleet. This agreement, which was signed on Octo-

ber 14, 1972, established the principle that each nation will have the opportunity to carry not less than one-third of all cargoes moving by sea between the United States and Russia. The U.S. share of planned Russian purchases of grain in Fiscal Year 1973 is 6.4 million tons but, because of the more attractive employment now available elsewhere for domestic tanker operators, those operators are expected to avail themselves of not more than 5.8 million tons of the grain cargoes reserved for the U.S. fleet.

As of January 4, 1973, 54 companies had applied for operating-differential subsidy to carry Russian grain, using a total of 86 ships. Fifteen of these ships have been chartered, some for consecutive voyages. All of the fifteen ships chartered thus far have been tankers.

The accomplishments outlined above are noteworthy ones which demonstrate the basic soundness of the President's maritime program. The actions taken by the Maritime Administration in implementing the President's program have served to eliminate or substantially reduce the urgent problems underlying the arguments for cargo preference at the time of the debates last Spring and early Summer. The developments since my June 12 letter will, in conjunction with Marad's on-going administration of the merchant marine program, provide a great economic lift to the maritime industry, and particularly to the bulk cargo carrying segment of that industry.

Despite the significant activities to promote U.S. flag tankers since my June 12 letter, we have continued to review the President's Maritime Program to determine if there are additional initiatives that could bring about an even stronger and more successful program to bolster our domestic tanker fleet. We have concentrated our attention in this review on the various initiatives mentioned in the letter as being under study by the Department. In conducting this review, we have sought to balance the competing interests identified by both the proponents and opponents of cargo preference. Major emphasis in this regard has also been placed upon the President's announced intention of reducing Federal expenditures in order to avoid the need for a tax increase.

Our exhaustive review of all of the various means available to assist the tanker and bulk cargo carrying segments of the U.S. merchant marine has resulted in the identification of a program which, if fully implemented, would not only yield benefits to the U.S. flag merchant marine, but would also have a favorable Federal budgetary impact.

That program consists of greater use by the United States Navy of U.S. flag tankers to provide logistic support for the Navy and otherwise work with the Navy to further the national maritime interest. This measure would produce more jobs for U.S. seamen and provide long-term employment of U.S. flag vessels.

To further this end, the Maritime Administration has been working as a member of the Navy/Marad Policy Planning Committee to determine the steps which can be taken and the economies available with greater Navy use of U.S. flag tankers. This effort has the following goals:

1. To strengthen overall U.S. seapower by retaining the maximum number of U.S. flag commercial ships and increasing the civilian labor force in the U.S. merchant marine.
2. To develop a strong, effective and experienced U.S. merchant marine fully responsive to national security needs.
3. To provide an economical balance of Navy and U.S. merchant marine manpower and ships for Navy use.
4. To permit Naval construction efforts to focus on combatant rather than noncombatant vessels.
5. To facilitate the implementation of an

all-volunteer force by providing for the substitution of merchant marine seamen for uniformed personnel.

These goals can be enhanced by transition from Navy to civilian manning of certain non-combatant vessels.

The Department of the Navy and the Maritime Administration have been actively testing steps that can be taken to implement this program by phasing in civilian crews to perform functions usually performed by military personnel and certain Navy-owned vessels and to look to future procurement of non-combatant ships from commercial sources.

Studies sponsored jointly by the Navy and the Maritime Administration have demonstrated the potential economic and operational feasibility of greater Navy use of U.S. flag tankers. Two of those tests, involving the SS *Erna Elizabeth* and the USNS *Taluga*, have established the operational feasibility of the use of merchant tankers and civilian crews for certain of the logistic missions in underway replenishment.

The Department of the Navy and the Maritime Administration are examining the specific extent to which merchant tankers should be substituted for naval vessels. There are two complementary proposals under active consideration.

The first proposal would be to convert existing Navy tankers to civilian manning. This action would create approximately 630 shipboard billets for merchant seamen.

The second proposal, which would be implemented over a longer period, relates to new tanker construction planned by the Navy. In place of Naval construction, ships would be built by private operators for long-term charter to the Navy. The Maritime Administration estimates that new tankers could be in construction under this plan in conformity with Navy replacement programs in FY 75 to 78. Assuming that eight such tankers would be a reasonable estimate in this regard, this would provide another 840 billets employment of merchant seamen. The feasibility of this second proposal is being examined by the Navy.

If both these proposals were implemented, employment would be provided for additional tanker seamen. The Maritime Administration estimates that the resulting employment would be a significant multiple of the amount of employment currently believed to be affected by lay-up.

The discussions between the Maritime Administration and the Navy with respect to implementation of this program are proceeding with the full support of the Office of Management and Budget.

The Department of Commerce is confident that implementation of this program will be responsive to the needs of U.S. flag merchant marine, and particularly to the needs of that segment of the industry which advocated oil import cargo preference last year. Our study of all of the various possible initiatives available to promote U.S. tankers has led us to conclude that this program, in conjunction with the direct financial assistance provided under the Merchant Marine Act and the Merchant Marine Amendments of 1970, constitutes the most appropriate and effective means of fostering a modern and efficient U.S. Merchant Marine, including tankers. Providing cargo preference for oil imports would not only unfairly affect consumers, but would extend the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 to commercial cargoes for the first time. It would not assure construction of the type of tanker fleet necessary to fulfill our merchant and national defense needs. Nor would it necessarily result in an upgrading of our merchant marine. Cargo preference would foster retaliatory measures by other nations and would encourage other trading restrictions which we believe will be to the serious long-term disadvantage of the United States.

The Department of Commerce believes that the adoption of the program set forth in this letter will, together with the on-going economic incentives contained in the Merchant Marine Act and the President's maritime program, stimulate a successful U.S. flag tanker construction and operation program.

We shall, of course, continue to evaluate the maritime program, and such other improvements and initiative as may from time to time appear desirable.

Sincerely,

PETER G. PETERSON,
Secretary of Commerce.

OWENS-ILLINOIS OUTLOOK

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Owens-Illinois Outlook, the corporation's employee newspaper, has long been one outstanding among industry. Published in Toledo, Ohio, the paper serves to keep O-I employees informed and up-to-date on issues pertaining to the company, their coworkers, and other worthy events.

Of particular note, and the reason why I call attention to it at this time, is an article in the December 1972 issue, documenting an employees' participation in the President's interchange program. The program was created by the White House to do two things:

First, the President hoped it would dispel some of the myths that exist in the public mind about the Government, and perhaps eliminate part of the misconceptions that color the facts in "John Doe's" impression of Washington.

Second, the President wanted to let one half know how the other half lives by having young executives from business and industry actually work a year or longer for Uncle Sam, while their Government counterparts went out and worked a like period in industry.

What transpired during the year an Owens-Illinois employee spent in Government makes for interesting reading and submitted herewith is the article for the RECORD:

AFTER YEAR IN WASHINGTON, JOHN CHANGES MIND ABOUT EFFICIENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, CALIBER OF "PAPER SHUFFLERS" AND "BUREAUCRATS"

The public's conception of the Federal Government is a curious mixture of fact and fancy, colored in varying degrees by what the individual has read, what he has heard, and his own experience.

One common, stereotyped impression pictures the Government as a labyrinth of agencies, populated by hordes of civil service bureaucrats who shuffle papers and strangle in red tape while they sweat out retirement—immune from the competitive forces faced by breadwinners in the "outside" world.

O-I's John Ingersoll, like most businessmen, had his own ideas about the Government. His conception wasn't quite the stereotype cited above, although it certainly included some of it. Mostly, John had reservations about the efficiency of Uncle Sam's myriad agencies and the caliber of some of the people running them.

Well, John has had to change some of his

ideas about the Government. He has a new impression of the massive 3-million-man organization that runs the country—the result of a one-year hitch as a member of Uncle Sam's team.

What's John's impression now?

The Government is still big—whether it's a "labyrinth" or not—and it will probably never escape the "bureaucratic" label. But—and this is an important "but"—the people running it are of very high caliber and many of their management techniques are of exceptional efficiency, considering the sheer size of the figures involved.

President Nixon may never learn of John's "turnaround" directly, but it would please him if he did: it would prove that the theory behind his Personnel Interchange program is sound—and the program is doing what the President hoped it might.

The President's Interchange Program was created by the White House to do two things:

First, the President hoped it would dispel some of the myths that exist in the public mind about the Government, perhaps eliminate part of the "fancy" that colors the facts in John Doe's impression of Washington.

Second, Mr. Nixon wanted to let the one half know how the other half lives, as the saying goes, by having young executives from business and industry actually work a year or longer for Uncle Sam, while their Government counterparts went out and worked a like period in industry.

There may have been a time, President Nixon said, when business and government could go their separate ways without thought of the other—but that time has passed. What affects one affects the other. The interests of the private sector are so closely entwined with those of the public sector that the two must get to know each other better.

That's why Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon set up the President's Interchange Program. That's why John Ingersoll went to Washington. And that's why John has changed his mind about the Government and the people who run it.

How does something like this come about?

First, your supervisor and O-I President Edwin D. Dodd recommend you for the interchange. Then—as John puts it—"you sever all ties with Owens-Illinois."

And "sever" is the right word.

John packed wife Martha, daughters, Cynthia, Katie and Laura, and miniature schnauzers Alex and Heidi into the car and moved to Fairfax, Virginia, one of the "bedroom" communities across the Potomac from Washington in which 350,000 Federal employees live.

The pay checks from Owens-Illinois stopped. For a year, John would be on Uncle Sam's payroll—one of the civil service "paper shufflers" he had heard so much about. He gave up many of his fringe benefits—retirement service credit, stock purchase plan, etc.

He had several choices, but chose HUD—the Government's Housing and Urban Development agency headed by George Romney. The HUD Research and Technology office, John says, is unique among government agencies: it is largely staffed by former NASA and Defense Department managers who have a record of efficient planning and control technologies. He thought he could learn something from them that would be useful to Owens-Illinois, at the same time contributing something that would be useful to them.

John had no way of knowing just how big a contribution he would make.

Ninety days after joining HUD's office of Administration Planning and Program Control, John found himself in charge of the office coordinating the work of 14 professionals. HUD itself, John says, has a staff of 16,000.

He found his assignment "challenging and rewarding," John says. "You're right on the spot participating in policy decisions and implementing existing policy."

As the months passed, his respect for his HUD associates, and for Government operations in general, increased. "The Government is ahead of us in planning and organization," he says. He was highly impressed by the caliber of the people with whom he worked. "Top management at HUD is as good as—if not better than—what you find in industry."

John's "most significant awakening," as he puts it, was related to national priorities. "In industry," he says, "policy evolves around a profit motive. In Government, however, a political motive is the guiding force."

His "second awakening" was a new appreciation of the sheer size of Government. "A budget plan at Owens-Illinois, typically, goes through four levels of management for approval," John says. "But in HUD, there were seventeen approval levels for each fiscal cycle."

"It's very hard to tell who has decision-making authority in Washington," he says. "The only way you can find out is through experience. You quickly learn that this authority is not 'translatable.' In other words, if a man at a certain level in one agency has the authority to make decisions, this doesn't mean that another man at the same level in another agency has similar authority."

John learned something about living in the nation's Capital, too. The traffic, he said, is "horrendous—the one sour note in my year in Washington," and this problem, already critical, is further compounded by a variety of demonstrators who frequently buy old junkers, drive them onto the freeways during the rush hour, and abandon them.

(John's Impressions of Washington and the people who work there, incidentally, match those of Ralph Wilson, control coordinator/box operations for the Forest Products Division. Ralph, O-I's first participant in the Presidential Interchange program, spent a year with the General Services Administration in 1970.

(Ralph, too, had some reservations about the people who staff Washington's "bureaucracy" before he went there. His feeling about Federal employees, he says, was summed up by the old saying "those who can, do—and those who can't, work for the Government." After working among them for a year, he says, "I came away from Washington generally impressed by the caliber of the people I was associated with.")

It wasn't all work during John's year in Washington. The Commission on Personnel Interchange arranged frequent "outside" activities for participants and their wives, including several off-the-cuff, candid briefings by senators, cabinet members, Supreme Court justices, and members of the White House staff.

John, who is back at work in the Corporate Information Systems Department, considers his participation in the program as a "once-in-a-lifetime" opportunity. He believes that he made a contribution to the Government—using his O-I data processing experience to help HUD automate some of its activities. And he knows that the Government gave a great deal in return, giving him a chance to see how various planning and control techniques work in a different environment.

Industry participants in the 1971 program received handsome plaques from President Nixon. O-I Board Chairman Ray Mulford, shown below presenting the plaque to John, is a member of the Presidential Interchange Commission that directs the program.

While each of the 24 participants received the president's plaque, John was the only one to receive a second commendation—a certificate of appreciation from HUD Secretary George Romney.

THE REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLE: A HARD LOOK AT ITS FUTURE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a presentation on the subject of remotely piloted vehicles that could offer capabilities of photographic, electronic reconnaissance, electronic warfare support, or weapons systems delivery has been offered before the ninth annual meeting of the Aviation Industries Association of America on January 10, 1973, by Mr. Robert R. Schwanhauser, executive vice president, Programs, Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical.

This Nation's air losses in the Vietnam conflict, the capture of pilots and aircrews, the spiraling costs of military aircraft demand that reevaluations of existing concepts be conducted. Beyond even these basic considerations is the sure knowledge that a technology exists which could minimize risk factors to human life in hostile, combat environments.

In his presentation, Mr. Schwanhauser appeals for the evolution of a national policy on RPVs.

In bringing Mr. Schwanhauser's presentation to the attention of my distinguished colleagues, I wish to add that his qualifications are distinguished by a lifelong pursuit of technical capabilities and practical applications of unmanned, remotely piloted vehicles. Mr. Schwanhauser is one of America's most highly qualified specialists in this field of aviation.

I am privileged to bring his remarks entitled "The RPV—A Hard Look at Its Future," to your attention:

THE RPV—A HARD LOOK AT ITS FUTURE

(Remarks by Robert R. Schwanhauser)

Gentlemen, my talk today is going to be a bit less nuts-and-bolts than many of you may expect from me.

That's because I feel that all of us here share common responsibilities of a more philosophical nature. We stand on the threshold of not just a New Year, but, I feel, a new era.

We have just come through the searing experience of our longest war—on a battlefield not of our choosing, a war that shouldn't be won, yet could not be lost.

The tragic events of Southeast Asia unfolded at the same time that dramatic changes were occurring in our own backyard. Words like "alienation" and "national priorities" became part of the fabric of our speech. And there developed a burgeoning reverence for life forms, particularly human life.

So here we sit, a room full of men committed to concerns that are not fully understood or shared by many of our fellow Americans.

However, it is not for us to feel superior, or wiser, because it's our very technological expertise that has painted us into a corner. Year after year we did more and better, sometimes forgetting that the millions we spent were really many individual dollars, painfully extracted from a lot of family budgets.

When I fly over Dallas, it is hard for me to realize that I am looking at a cost equivalent to what we have lost in Southeast Asia. The seemingly endless carpet of homes and apartments, shopping centers and skyscrap-

ers; the total appraised value of our nation's eighth largest city, represents the cost of just our aircraft losses. If every structure in Dallas were to vanish today the economic impact would shake the world, but because the aircraft were nibbled away from us one or two at a time, often we forget how quickly the dollars tend to accumulate.

Clearly, those of us involved in developing the arsenal of weapons our country must have need to take a hard look at the path we've been following.

We all know in the future that more must be done with less—but I'm not sure that the direction we have been going indicates much promise of success.

Here's a cost curve on fighter aircraft. Sure, we're all aware that costs rise each year. But we usually plot on long paper, so we don't fully appreciate the steepness of the curve. Here it is, in real bucks, for the past fifty years.

It makes one wonder; what will the costs be in 1980 or 1990? It's a chilling thought to realize that by 1980 the aircraft losses which we sustained in World War II will project to 1,000 billion dollars.

We aren't the only problem area, the armor curve looks almost as steep and just as straight. And if the tank builders had to work with titanium and zirconium, as we do, they'd be on the same curve.

As I see it, we have three essential parameters that define the new ballfield in which we all must play. Obviously stringent financial limitations, the potential of having to fight in much more lethal environments, and the necessity of making our whole defense posture compatible with a genuine ground swell of humanism that is becoming part of our national conscience.

I honestly believe that if we fail to relate to any of these three factors in a very positive way, we are out of touch with the real world.

I am not a prophet, and I have no magic panacea to offer. I'm not even sure we will be able to play ball in the rather constrained new field that has been defined for us.

But my entire adult life has been spent in an area I believe represents one of the many new paths that must be found, and found fast, if we are to protect our nation not only from potential aggressors but also from ourselves.

My background, of course, is in Remotely Piloted Vehicles, RPVs. Today's acronym doesn't really give the historical sweep of the discipline. RPVs have been around for a long time, actually almost paralleling the history of manned flight.

When most people think of RPVs they think of targets, and understandably so. I would guess there have been more than fifty thousand target flights in the past twenty odd years. I know of a single maneuverable drone that has been flown, recovered, and refloated as many as seventy-seven times and is still flying! Targets have provided us with an unglamorous but very cost-effective period of learning.

Urgent Southeast Asia operational needs demanded an upgrading of these target vehicles into reconnaissance drones. The first units were fielded in less than 90 days—obviously, off-the-shelf, quick-fix modifications—but birds which, in spite of these limitations, performed surprisingly well.

The RPV horizon broadened a little more with electronic intelligence versions, leaflet droppers, and some tentative weapons delivery systems. But, they all had a common limitation: they were basically modified versions of existing target drones.

They used what subsystems were readily available, and functioned with only a limited degree of pilot participation.

These efforts, although responsive to urgent national needs, have been somewhat detrimental to the ultimate growth of RPVs, because they froze operational experience at the

level of those expediently created vehicles. The military user in the field felt that what he got represented the ultimate potential of RPVs.

Actually, the RPV technological potential was being demonstrated a quarter of a million miles distant. While we were transmitting video and control data from a bird 200 miles away, the Soviets were maneuvering their Rover on the moon. Or NASA was transmitting pictures from their moon vehicle.

So, let's take this technology that really represents what RPVs can do today and apply it to this decade's tactical military needs.

In addition to speed and altitude, survivability has always been a function of size, radar cross-section, IR signature, or the physical presented area of vulnerable components. RPVs are harder to acquire, to track, and to hit. Overall, they are roughly one-tenth the target of a current fighter bomber.

They could always go where man could not. They could pull higher g's and outmaneuver a good fighter.

They have always had this control potential, but until recent years, they were blind and dumb. Now, with the improvements in sensor and computer technology, we can really put the pilot in the loop by providing him with the visual cues he needs for his unique decision-making process. And you get his human judgment at its undegraded best. Immune to the environment, to fatigue, or injury.

The pilot of the next generation of RPVs will enjoy supersensory participation, without the limitations of normal apprehension and risk-factor evaluation that have been an instinctive part of the human animal since we swung down from the trees.

Strike accuracy has always been a function of range to the target, but so has survivability. The Nazi oil fields at Ploesti were a classic, grim example. The low-level bombing attrition was a staggering 34 percent. The high-level attrition 4.2 percent.

And that's the bitter trade-off that still exists thirty years later. What level of attrition can you endure to get a reasonable probability of kill? It takes a Solomon to decide when a target is worth a million bucks—only to find out it might have to cost ten million to destroy.

RPVs offer an alternative. Since they are inexpensive and unmanned vehicles, they can be flown to these tough targets, achieving CEPs of 20 feet, even while providing their own bomb-damage assessment.

This new breed of RPVs would not be built to man-rated, Mil-Spec standards, but birds designed with cost as the chief yardstick. Electronic components from your kid's transistor radio. nonconventional fuselage fabrication techniques.

Bear in mind, I am talking about the potential of a whole family of RPVs, configured for specific missions. They could be photographic, electronic reconnaissance, electronic warfare support, or weapons system delivery. Today, industry could produce recoverable strike drones for as little as half a million dollars. Or even expendable, electronic suppression, single-use drones, for a tenth that amount. And, of equal importance in these days of rapidly changing requirements, an RPV family would be adaptable through its life cycle to missions which might not have been conceived when the birds were on the drawing boards.

In addition to low acquisition cost, operating and maintenance costs for RPVs would be fractional compared to today's aircraft.

In difficult combat situations, a typical squadron of 12 manned fighter-bombers requires the support of twenty other aircraft of various types. A similar RPV force should require from 2 to 5 aircraft, this figure including an air-launch capability for the RPVs.

Training costs are another substantial area

of savings. Simulation exercises can give RPV pilots almost 100 percent training fidelity. Actual RPV flights can be limited to those required to maintain launch and recovery crew proficiency. It's a far different story with manned squadron proficiency training today. The pilot training is expensive, time consuming, and often with its own high attrition rate.

Tomorrow's RPVs would look significantly different from those in use today. They would be designed with an emphasis on modularity, so they could be flexibly tailored for specific missions.

They would probably run in the three to six thousand-pound category, have ranges of 600 to one thousand nautical miles and a maneuver capability of ten g's. They would have a fifty percent disposable load capability, with modular payloads. They would probably best be designed for the high subsonic speed regime, with a very low (about 200-foot) altitude capability. They would also have very low radar cross sections, small IR signatures, and be difficult to detect visually.

In short: they would be tough, cheap birds that would extend the skills of a pilot into presently inaccessible regimes.

No one assumes that RPVs could ever replace manned aircraft. But they would enhance man's capability by providing operations into areas that are now too hostile or too perilous.

A family of cheap RPVs would let a tactical commander decide "yes" on those marginal missions that currently get a "no" decision. When the weather is on the ragged edge; the flack a real thicket; the target too hardened; the approach too limited; then you are in RPV country.

The type of RPV I'm talking about could not have been built ten years ago, or even five. Propulsion and airframes were there, but not the avionics.

With current computer-based, miniaturized avionics, RPVs could navigate; have a guidance memory capability; automatic flight control; communications links with their operators; employ ECM; perform self-diagnosis.

And most important of all: they could have the sensor technology to enable man to make the critical value judgments that only he can make. As good as the "black boxes" are, only a human computer can rapidly "see" something, discriminate, and make a decision.

So we find that RPVs are really here today, not years downstream. And they represent the ideal technology transfer medium, since their growth can affectively exploit most of the advances that have taken place in the other science disciplines.

And not surprisingly, a lot of people, in and out of government and our industry, realize these facts. There is a great deal of media activity about the RPV potential. And, although there are a lot of small, low-key efforts by a variety of agencies, there is no identifiable national policy or overall direction for this flurry of RPV activity.

A good deal of dedication exists at the service agency level, yet the welter of RFOs, PMDs, and PMPs seem to indicate a lack of coordinated leadership that prudent management demands.

Here are the fiscal '73 and '74 RDT&E budgets for missiles and aircraft. In each year less than one percent has been allocated to RPV programs.

Everyone seems excited about the dawn of the RPV era, yet with a one percent commitment, the sun can never rise!

Even a modest realignment in RDT&E funding offers the potential of dramatically breaking that insidiously straightline of tactical weapons system costs.

We're at the start of a new era in our defense posture, an era of paradox. We face a spectrum of future threats that promise to

be substantially more demanding than any we have encountered in Southeast Asia. Yet, we must be more effective against these tougher targets, at less cost.

Concurrently, we must maintain a capability of providing our allies with tangible immediate assistance in any conflict, one that could break out anywhere in the world, as soon as tomorrow.

And, most important of all: we must be able to do these things without ever again having our most precious national resource languish for years in some other foul Hanoi Hilton!

In summary: I strongly believe that any one of these factors justifies the serious consideration of RPVs for a role in our mixed-force arsenal. When all of these considerations are combined, it makes the evolution of a national policy on RPVs a compelling need.

It would be a low-technological-risk building-block venture, and, surprisingly, one of very modest cost. The first step that is needed is just an acknowledgement that times have changed.

All of nature teaches us that Form Follows Function. In that same adaptive way, the form of our national defense force must inexorably be dictated by its changing functions.

Many of us are convinced that RPVs can make a pivotal contribution to that new evolving form during the coming decade.

Thank you for your courteous attention.

FALL DINNER MEETING OF THE H. H. ARNOLD CHAPTER OF THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of September 8, 1972, I had the pleasure of attending the fall dinner meeting of the H. H. Arnold Chapter of the Air Force Association.

At that time, the invocation prayer was delivered by John F. Dolan, past president of the H. H. Arnold Chapter. I found the prayer very moving and inspiring and insert it at this point in the RECORD so that its meaning might be shared with the Members of Congress:

PRAYER

Almighty Father we who are present here tonight wish to express our thanks and the thanks of those with whom we are associated for the abundant blessings you have bestowed upon our country and our people,—we are very grateful.

In your divine wisdom guide our leaders and the leaders of all other people of this world in exploiting the full meaning of your golden rule. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Open the eyes of all your servants and guide them in improving their understanding of and their responsibilities to each other.

Provide strength and perseverance for all the members of our world society whose present distressed state as prisoners of war, prisoners of poverty or prisoners of ideologies which destroy man's mind and enslave his soul. Help us in this very short span in which we live our lives on this planet to positively become a strong building block in your divine plan rather than a rotted timber. We ask your special blessings on those here tonight and those closest in their thoughts. Bless all prisoners of war and strengthen their ability to persist.

DEPARTURE OF JAMES V. SMITH OF OKLAHOMA

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that I speak today about the departure from Washington of my good friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives, James Vernon Smith of Oklahoma.

Jim Smith has compiled an outstanding record of service to his country. He was elected to the House of Representatives for the 90th Congress and served from 1967 to 1969. During his years on Capitol Hill, he earned a distinguished record and the deep respect of his colleagues. He proved to be an able legislator who won the admiration and friendship of Members on both sides of the aisle.

In 1969, President Nixon appointed Jim as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. His choice was an excellent one, and I can say in all sincerity that Jim Smith is the most able Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration that I have ever known.

Because of the rural nature of my congressional district, I have had a good deal of contact with the Farmers Home Administration. The programs of this fine agency have had a wide impact in North Carolina and have greatly assisted my constituents in a number of ways.

I know that as the Administrator of FHA, Jim Smith has been commendably responsive to the needs of rural Americans. Other Members here today have listed his many accomplishments as FHA Administrator and have paid tribute to his administrative achievements.

I would like to remark on Jim Smith's dedication to rural America and his philosophy of government which has served us so well. His approach is well stated in the following letter which he addressed to the members of the Future Farmers of America:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

America will turn again to the countryside as she struggles to find solutions to urban crises. Crowded cities with paralyzed traffic and polluted environment are poor substitutes for open space and clean air. But though we can point to much that is good in the country, rural America also has weaknesses that must be eliminated.

Our Farmers Home Administration programs are keyed to the principle of rural self-help. Vocational agriculture, too, espouses this principle. It has shown strength and adaptability under changing conditions, making it a most fitting partner in this program of "Building Our American Communities." We are pleased to work with you.

Within today's generation of young people are tomorrow's community leaders. Each lesson should result in penetrating and thought-provoking discussions as you ready yourself for a role in the action.

We have much to do. Let's get on with it.

JAMES V. SMITH,
Administrator.

I would also like to include for the RECORD Jim Smith's remarks at the Fu-

ture Farmers of America's 45th National Convention in Kansas City, Mo., on October 11, 1972:

It is truly a privilege for me to be with you, for several reasons. I have a very high opinion of young people—and I know of no group of young people that merits such an opinion more than you do.

Part of this interest goes back to the days when I was an FFA member in Grady County, Oklahoma. It's good now to think of those days, and to relive some of the experiences that were wrapped up in my wheat and beef projects.

Part of the interest I have in young people comes from the fact that I have three children of my own, and I want them to live in a better world than the one that I enjoyed. And this is a wish that I have for all of you, too.

And another part of my interest comes from the fact that there is always something happening around young people. I've found that, when I associate with you, I haven't the time to grow old—you keep me too busy for that.

Perhaps these are some of the reasons why we have the Build Our American Communities program today. About three and a half years ago, when I first became Administrator of Farmers Home Administration, I began to wonder how we could make things happen in rural America—good things. It occurred to me that we Americans presently enjoy a high standard of living because our forebears had the foresight to bring education in production agriculture to young people. If young men and women could help bring our present agricultural production plant into being—why could not young energies and imaginations work to improve rural communities, bring new opportunities, and improve the rural life we all know and love so well?

Several of us, including your leaders, talked about possibilities and from this, the Build Our American Communities program was born.

I wish I could say that everyone immediately jumped on the bandwagon, but that was not so. A nucleus of people worked out a program and gave it directions, and a selling program aimed at your national officers took place at this convention three years ago. They liked the idea, and helped to promote it.

Finally, the program rounded into shape, and it was presented to the public at a luncheon for Congressmen in July of 1970. Your national officers carried the message, and they carried it well.

At the FFA convention that fall, I had the privilege of introducing the program along with my Oklahoma friend and your then-national president—Harry Birdwell—and his officers. You may have seen the film, "Build Our American Communities," that was made at that time.

By now vocational agriculture and the FFA organization were behind the effort. We had engineered and signed the first memorandum of understanding between Vocational Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture. It was signed by your FFA president, your national advisor, the president of the vo-ag teachers association, the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, and the Secretary of Agriculture. It was a landmark—and an evidence of our ability to work together that, up to that time, had been formalized only by a handshake.

Last year the Berrien, Georgia, chapter won your first national award—and now it's time for the second national winner to be chosen.

The National FFA Foundation recently sent me a copy of a news release. The story told briefly of each of your projects, and I assure you I have studied it carefully.

I was very pleased to receive this particular piece of publicity.

There are a variety of reasons.

In the first place, as the BOAC program was being formed, we were asked to tell you what your projects should be. I resisted this, indicating that you needed to tell us what you should do. What your communities wanted to do. What each of you thought you ought to do.

That news story told me many things, including that the ingenuity of young America is very much alive, and residing in the Future Farmers of America.

The story also told me that you are making progress within BOAC. Our first experiences with your activities indicated that the age-old—very worthwhile, but age-old—programs of roadside cleanup and similar efforts had been transferred to BOAC. This is a part of Building Our American Communities, but it is the easy part, and I'm pleased to see that your present projects show more insight into things that really go to the heart of community needs. I commend you all for your work—and urge that you go further with it.

There is a third fact I gleaned from the news release—and which I want to talk with you about at greater length. I am fully aware that this is a political year. As the Presidentially-appointed administrator of a major federal agency, my schedule confirms that there is a special effort being made to tell voters what is being accomplished by government.

I am very aware that this is no place for partisan politics—no place in which to tout a particular candidate or party.

On the other hand, young people such as yourselves must be aware of, and involved in, the political process. To a degree you are, in your own chapter, state and national elections.

Personally, I believe implicitly in our system which demands that a candidate lay his record on the line for the approval or disapproval of the electorate.

On the other hand—you—the voter—must also take a responsibility. That is to read, to be aware, to make an intelligent choice. No one "tells it the way it is." They tell it as they see it and you must adjust and adapt their words in an effort to find the truth. Insofar as national elections are concerned, that became your responsibility when President Nixon signed the law to give 18-year-olds the vote.

More and more decisions will need to be made by you—and this is the final reason I was so pleased to read your news release. We in FHA provided a way to encourage you young people to perform in your own best interest. That news story tells me that you are doing it. Government didn't need to push, or cajole, or bribe—it needed to show you an opportunity, and each of you worked to fulfill that opportunity in the way that could be most helpful to you and your home communities.

This, to me, is the essence of what the present administration has had to say to the people of the country. It does not say "here, do this." It does say "here is some help—now work and think so the results you achieve are the best for all involved." This BOAC program is an encouragement in that spirit, and I commend every one of you on the fine way in which you have responded—to your own benefit, but more importantly, to the advantage of all of the people in your community.

By nature, the art of politics is people-oriented. More and more, we are learning that, to be successful, business and government must also be people-oriented.

I'm pleased to say that, while Farmers Home Administration has always been oriented toward those it served—in short, while it has always been a people-oriented agency—we are still learning to express ourselves in those terms. For example, our news

stories used to begin by telling people that we had installed a water system using 38 miles of pipe, or that we had financed 90,000 houses. The news story summarizing this year's accomplishments read: "... more than three million rural citizens acquired better homes, strengthened farming operations or improved their communities."

Next year I hope the summary story will tell another story of your innovations. Our agency has just recently been granted authority that says "Loans may also be made under this subtitle . . . to youths who are rural residents to enable them to operate enterprises in connection with their participation in 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America and similar organizations . . ." Note that loans are specified, so income-producing projects are implicit in the law. We are at work on some guidelines that will help our county offices put this concept to work—and again, we want your help and suggestions as to ways in the new authority may be used. We need to learn its limitations and expand and adapt the law to better fulfill your needs.

The new law I mentioned is the Rural Development Act of 1972—a comprehensive piece of legislation that gives Farmers Home Administration a lead role in helping to build better rural communities and a better life for rural people.

Presently you may know that our agency has lending authority in three fields—to family farmers to help them own land and pay operating expenses, as well as to reimburse them when natural disaster disrupts their operations. To rural people that they may become homeowners, or that desirable rental space may be built, or for the housing of farm labor. And to communities to plan for water and sewer systems, as well as for system installation and creation of sanitary landfills.

In all, there are some 20 different programs we operate, each providing credit to those unable to secure it from regular commercial sources, and affording supervision to borrowers to help make the loans successful ones.

Now, with the new authority, we may become primary sources of credit for needed community facilities for health, firefighting, community centers, roads and other amenities. In addition, we may make loans to develop areas for business or industry to use, may loan money to private business or industry to establish new employment, and we have authority to help with pollution abatement and control.

Never before has such an arsenal of assistance been available to rural communities. Some of these authorities will be useful in your BOAC work. We are drafting administrative rules and regulations as rapidly as possible, and will put the law into effect, through our 42 state offices and 1,750 county offices, as quickly as we can.

Perhaps next year your news stories will tell of some successes in the use of these new authorities. I hope so. We are anxious to work with you for the betterment of rural America—and the benefit of all America.

Three keys to achieving the kind of rural America you and I want—now and for the future—are *Energy—Innovation—and Involvement*. It so happens that these are three ingredients that you are blessed with in great abundance. Since the future belongs to you, I can think of no better people in which to place our confidence and our resources. You are the builders of our future.

Thank you and Godspeed.

It is unusual to encounter a man who combines legislative talent, administrative ability, and a deep concern for his fellow Americans. Jim Smith is such a man, and he will be sorely missed in Washington.

DES, THE DELANEY AMENDMENT AND DRUGS

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of misinformation given out in recent months on the subject of diethylstilbestrol, the drug commonly referred to as DES. In an address last December at the convention of the Iowa Grain and Feed Association, our colleague, BILL SCHERLE, attempted to set the record straight on this matter.

His remarks follow and I commend them to the attention of all Members: DES, THE DELANEY AMENDMENT AND DRUGS

It is a great pleasure to be here today and a signal honor to address such a distinguished group of experts on the important and difficult topic of "DES, the Delaney Amendment and Drugs."

The drug Diethylstilbestrol, commonly referred to as DES, has created an interesting set of circumstances—the effect of a desire to do good, compounded by legislation designed to assure this end, resulting in a situation that has frustrated the wishes and needs of the American public. A handful of men referring to obscure possibilities of harm are quoting statistical odds of hazard incomprehensible to the average mind.

Most of us have been exposed only to the tip of the iceberg in the true situation concerning the use of diethylstilbestrol. Certain facts are presumed self evident—(1) that diethylstilbestrol is a carcinogen, (2) that some young girls whose mothers were treated with therapeutic doses of this drug developed a rare form of cancer which may or may not have been associated with the use of this drug, (3) that approximately 2½% of the beef animals fed stilbestrol have been shown to contain measurable residues of this drug, (4) that the law forbids residues in the meat supply, and (5) that a radioactive tracer study on the drug diethylstilbestrol performed at Fargo, North Dakota, showed residues of radioactivity at the end of seven days withdrawal.

Based on these facts and a number of Congressional Hearings at which Food and Drug was taken strongly to task for allowing the continued use of DES in the feeding of beef animals, the Commissioner of Food and Drug finally felt that he was forced to take the steps which will by January 1st result in the banning of the use of this drug in beef production.

I hope today to be able to discuss with you some of the not so obvious aspects of this iceberg to help us realize how it is possible to get into a situation of this sort and what is required in the way of legislation, which Bill has already proposed to Congress, to insure that this type of situation does not arise to frustrate the proper use of valuable drugs in the future.

Not long ago, "DES" was an expression known only to the relatively small circle of professionals who actually use it. Once its value had been firmly established in the meat industry this awkward mouthful of a chemical was rarely discussed. Feed producers and cattlemen understood its merits and were glad to take advantage of its aid to the rising domestic and foreign demand for high quality beef. No one in this room needs to be told how this hormone has contributed to increasing the output of the meat industry, more quickly, cheaply and safely than any other single chemical. For twenty years, DES has been showering its benefits on producer and consumer alike.

These benefits went largely unacknowledged by the public, however, because the public was simply unaware of them. Most people in this country take for granted an unending and plentiful flow of foodstuffs from farm to table. They do not stop to think how it happens, how the supply never dwindles even though there are always more mouths to feed and a higher standard of living to meet. DES is one of the great scientific discoveries which has made it possible. Without the inventive genius of men like Dr. Wise Borroughs and his colleagues at Iowa State University, agriculture in this country would never have graduated from its horse-and-buggy days in the nineteenth century to the realm of fastmoving technology in the twentieth.

Unfortunately, too few people appreciate this fact. There are even some who deplore it. Many a consumer activist would jump to his feet shouting in protest at what I have just said. Praising the virtues of DES is tantamount in some quarters to shilling for cancer. As you all know, DES has been known to cause cancer in laboratory animals. That fact has been widely disseminated in the last few years and is the source of most of the extremely unfavorable publicity DES has been getting. It was also the catalyst for the Food and Drug Administration's reluctant decision to ban the offending hormone from animal feed after the first of the year. It automatically triggered the inflexible Delaney amendment prohibiting any trace of a carcinogenic substance in human food.

This is the sum and substance of the information reported by the opponents of DES. Like so many other issues relating to agriculture, the debate over DES hit the headlines hampered by emotional rhetoric and slanted or incomplete information.

Vague accusations have plagued the discussion of DES.

If there is one word calculated to strike fear into the hearts of most people, it is cancer—and with good reason. The disease is a painful debilitator and a deadly killer. Because research into its cause and cure is still on the threshold of significant advance, however, cancer scares are still a very damaging way of mobilizing public opinion against an unpopular product. If you tell people that DES has caused cancer in rats, they will naturally be frightened and call for its immediate elimination. If the true facts—all the true facts—were widely known, it is my belief that the public would endorse the continued use of DES as enthusiastically as most professionals familiar with its properties.

First, the public should be reminded that DES has been safely used in animal fodder for twenty years. At present, 75–80% of all the beef consumed is raised on feed laced with DES. Two decades without a single known instance of harm caused to human beings from eating meat produced on DES should provide a long enough testing period to satisfy the most scrupulous consumer advocate. Second, people should be informed about the size of the dosage required to induce cancer in laboratory animals. Translated into human terms, it means that a person would have to eat 5,500 pounds of beef liver to ingest a comparable quantity. It should also be remembered that most harmless substances would be lethal if injected directly into the bloodstream in such massive doses. Third, the extent of contamination from DES should be better publicized. Most people probably do not realize that only in the animal's liver has DES residue ever been detected. Even those showed only minute particles, less than two parts per billion in many cases. This is equivalent to one and a half drops in 25,000 gallons of liquid, or to a couple of seconds in thirty years. To put it in another perspective, the largest amount of DES ever discovered in beef liver is far less than the average woman's normal level of hormone production.

To handle some of these things in the

order of sequence: The problem of the increasing number of residues originated with the development of an extremely sensitive method of assay supposed to report residues down to 2 parts per billion which was then presumably further improved to measure residues as low as $\frac{1}{2}$ part per billion.

At this point I'd like to say that there have been continuing controversial statements as to whether or not this method is truly accurate in its low level. Food and Drug themselves have said that this method is sensitive only to 2 parts per billion and should not be used below this level, whereas the Department of Agriculture feels that they can operate below this point.

This is an important factor in our controversy. A substantial portion of the residues found under current conditions of use have been below 2 parts per billion and if in effect there is any question as to whether or not the method is reliable there is also the question of whether or not there truly were residues.

Considering the issue as to whether or not this is a reliable method of testing let us look further into the situation.

The first change in the Food and Drug approach was to increase the withdrawal time from 2 days to 7 days on the assumption that this would give an adequate safety factor and insure that there were no residues in the beef supply. At the time this was done there was no indication that 7 days might not be a long enough period for withdrawal. When this new withdrawal was instituted it was noted by the Department of Agriculture and the Congressional critics that the number of positives reported did not decrease although the levels of residue being reported were substantially lower. Presumably this indicated misuse on the part of the feeder.

In an attempt to understand how this could be, a study was instituted at Fargo, North Dakota in which radioactive diethylstilbestrol was fed to steers which were then killed at graded withdrawal times. In those animals which were slaughtered 7 days after withdrawal of feeding diethylstilbestrol, it was found that radioactivity still existed in the liver and kidney tissues. This activity could not be confirmed to be diethylstilbestrol by other tests due to the extremely low levels of radioactivity observed. However, this information was considered serious enough by the Commissioner to cancel the approval for the use of this drug in all feeds.

Subsequent to this cancellation the USDA initiated additional research to expand on their preliminary Fargo study both at Beltsville, Md. and at Fargo, N. D. Using the same testing procedure but extending withdrawal time in one case to 10 days and in another to 14 days, USDA reported that there are no residues measurable by the radioactive method.

It is interesting to note that the first research report contained sufficient evidence for the Commissioner to cancel the clearance. However, it appears that additional information describing that the drug can be used safely and without residue was not considered sufficient evidence to reinstate the use of DES.

Currently the USDA is evaluating the use of radioactive diethylstilbestrol implants and dependent on the results, which should be reported in January, it is quite possible the use of DES is lost completely.

Commissioner Edwards of Food and Drug has made repeated statements that he does not feel that diethylstilbestrol is a hazard—that the nature of the restriction imposed on him by the Delaney Amendment is a legal one dealing with specific wording of the law which forbids the use of the drug under certain conditions.

We feel that it is in the interest of the nation to give the Commissioner the discretion which he needs in order to be able to use

not only this drug, but other drugs which have a specific benefit or value to the well-being of our people.

In connection with this, a Bill—H.R. 16507, has been introduced by me and co-sponsors such as Bob Poage of Texas, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Sam Steiger of Arizona, Chuck Thone of Nebraska and other concerned legislators to give the Commissioner this discretion. The effect of this Amendment to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act will give the Secretary room to exercise scientific prerogatives in determining whether or not a drug or additive is truly safe rather than being limited by the term "absolute zero" when each day drives home the truth that scientific progress tells us there is no "absolute zero." Mother nature herself cannot comply with the Delaney Amendment.

In discussing diethylstilbestrol we would like to reemphasize that no one is interested in introducing a hazard into the food supply. The USDA has proposed the funding of a study at Southern Illinois University whose explicit purpose will be to find out whether or not the residues in beef liver do or do not cause cancer and if they do at what levels!

The appropriateness of a study of this nature is timely since it may very easily be one of the opening wedges in determining exactly what amount of hazard, if any, is involved in establishing safe level for residue in connection with a drug reported to be a carcinogen.

This study would examine the feeding of beef livers in which the diethylstilbestrol residue would be accumulated through feeding excessive levels of DES and then slaughtering without withdrawal, so that we could observe the results in tests on mice which have been fed this residue as it naturally occurs in the liver. It is important to note that the residue in the liver is a metabolite of diethylstilbestrol and is a possible solution to our current predicament. This would be a three year study simulating the full life span of man and could give some scientific background for establishing what sort of hazard the public faces.

It is interesting to note that if the bureaucracy had not been in such a hurry to make a preliminary report on the studies, and instead waited until the full study had been completed, it would have been possible to have established a proper withdrawal period for this drug which would have satisfied all the requirements of the now existing law!

It is also important for us to say to ourselves that if the 7 day withdrawal period, as initially established by Food and Drug, was not the correct amount of time required to clear the tissues of residues, then presumably some substantial portion of those positives reported by the USDA in connection with monitoring our supply of meat, were not the fault of the producers but the fault of an incorrect withdrawal time.

Therefore, we could safely assume that once a new withdrawal period, based on the current scientific knowledge, is established we should see a substantial decrease, if not total elimination, in the number of animals reported as containing diethylstilbestrol residues.

Meanwhile, what does this mean to producers? If we assume that the value of stilbestrol is something on the order of a 15% production improvement we can say that the increased cost of production must be absorbed to some extent, depending on bargaining strength, in every phase of cattle production—from the cow calf operator to the feedlot operator to the packer and eventually to the consumer. The real question is who benefits from the current situation, and the real answer is nobody.

When the law puts us in the position of knowing that the affect of adherence to the law will result in something that is not to the

common good, then it is time for those of us who have the understanding on the interests of the public at heart to stand up and be counted for a change in the law and this in essence is what is being done. It is important that the public know all the facts. The public in its wisdom is capable of making sound judgment. What is required is information, and this is what we have tried to give you today—to show you the true situation. The facts should be presented so that all can judge—so that all can indicate as a concerned public what the proper action should be in the future.

People might also be reassured to learn what DES really is. Like one of the major components of most birth control pills, DES is a synthetic estrogen, a chemist's simulation of a natural hormone. According to the information now available to scientists, the structure, mechanism and biological effects of natural and synthetic estrogens are very similar. Thus if DES is banned from animal rations, the FDA should really also outlaw lettuce, alfalfa, soybeans and corn, because all contain natural estrogens. Honey and dried milk are both guilty by association with estrogens, and eggs—those perennial favorites of health food faddists and dieters—are bursting with estrogen (up to 2000 parts per billion!) The public would also be relieved to know that doctors prescribe DES for certain ailments. Doses of DES up to 15 milligrams per week are permitted for medical treatment.

In addition to its therapeutic uses, DES entails certain practical advantages of which the public should not be ignorant. Conversely when DES is withdrawn from the market entirely, economical benefits will be forfeit. Estimates of the monetary value of DES vary, but most professionals agree that the price of beef will rise an average of at least 10¢ per pound, more likely as high as 15¢ or even 20¢. This aspect of DES usage is never mentioned by the scare tacticians. It suits their purpose to emphasize only the negative potential of the chemical and to ignore its proven value. Then, too, the elimination of DES would slow beef production at least 15%.

What I have been outlining to you so far is basically a public relations campaign. Essential as it is, however, developing effective public relations is only part of the problem. A more immediate obstacle to a rational policy on DES is presented by the so-called Delaney amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. This provision, which, as you know, prohibits the most infinitesimal trace of any carcinogen, forced the FDA to prescribe the use of DES in animal feed. The law will be fifteen years old next year and, in the light of what we now know about DES, is long overdue for a revision. No one questions its objective, the prevention of cancer. In fact, I believe we should encourage research into the causes of cancer in human beings because, in my view, it can only vindicate the beef industry. The more the consumer knows about beef the better, because he cannot help but come away convinced that the American food producer provides the best meat in the world. No, it is indisputable that the chief culprit is not food additives like DES but extraneous cancer-producing agents like cigarettes. If the consumer activists want a target, let them zero in on that.

In the meantime, though, we must rescue DES from the oblivion that threatens it as of January 1st. The Delaney amendment must be modified and modernized so that the law conforms to the latest scientific knowledge about DES and other chemical additives. Instead of the present arbitrary and inflexible zero tolerance level, the amendment should permit the Secretary of HEW to consult toxicologists and nutritional chemists to determine appropriate safe limits for DES residue in meat. Newly developed, sophisti-

cated measuring equipment, unknown in 1958 when the Delaney amendment was passed, can now pinpoint minuscule amounts of the hormone—as small as one part per trillion. The presence of such tiny traces cannot seriously be considered a health hazard. Exactly where a safe and reasonable tolerance level lies, however, cannot be defined with certainty at this point. Further research is needed before the FDA can issue positive guidelines. The agency itself is willing to undertake the research but needs the consent of Congress to countermand the Delaney amendment.

Since the DES debate first heated up, I have repeatedly urged the House to consider legislation modifying the Delaney clause. I plan to reintroduce an identical measure in the upcoming 93rd Congress. Until their constituents are persuaded that DES, properly employed, poses no threat to their health, however, a majority of the members may be unlikely to back my proposal. And that will require a concerted campaign to bring the facts—all of them—to the forefront of public attention. We must refute the false allegations and dispel the miasma of distrust that poisons the atmosphere of producer-consumer relations. Farmers and their allies in the agribusiness community, like you, have to correct the erroneous image created by such charges and restore the faith which Americans once had in the free enterprise system.

If we neglect this obligation, we will lose much more than the convenience and economy of a single food additive. Progress in technology depends to a large extent to a favorable climate of public opinion. Few technical advances were made through most of human history because men were afraid of the unknown, abhorred change and clung to all the old traditions. It is only recently that we have been able to distinguish science from magic and to expand the realm of the possible by manufacturing new and beneficial substances hitherto uncreated. If the climate of distrust and fear inhibits research into new fields, we will all be the losers. This is no idle apprehension. Research chemists and pharmaceutical manufacturers have expressed their misgivings on this subject many times. Should the government make it impossible or unprofitable for the industry to venture into untried areas, they will simply continue to produce the old "safe" items and new developments will come to a standstill.

America has not become the world's foremost farming nation only to retreat in confusion to the old regressive ways. As in every other competitive industry, you slide backward if you stand still. We have to run hard just to stay in place and we want to do even better than that. How we come out of the debate on DES and the Delaney amendment will thus affect our future status in many related areas. It is up to all the members of the agribusiness community to insure that the issue is resolved rationally and fairly.

THE RETIREMENT OF MARY BAILENSON

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 21, 1973, our whole community will honor and express our appreciation to Mary Bailenson, who is retiring after an extraordinary 48 years of service at the Jewish Community Center of Cleveland.

It is difficult to describe the warmth and esteem with which we all hold Mary. She has been a pillar not only of the Jewish community but a helping hand to our entire community.

Mary started her exemplary service in 1925 at the 55th Street branch of the Council Educational Alliance, moving to a new office in 1927 at the active and vital CEA building at 135th and Kinsman.

By 1948, Mary was a mainstay at the new Shaker-Lee branch of the then newly formed Jewish Community Center of Cleveland. When the new main building was completed on Mayfield Road, Mary was on duty.

The tens of thousands of people who have been touched by Mary will be eternally grateful for her gentle, warm graciousness and strength.

Mary Bailenson has been, and will continue to be, a blessing to our entire community. We extend our congratulations to Mary on this great day of celebration and wish her many fruitful, healthy years to come.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay humble tribute to our great 33d President, Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman, more than any other President since Andrew Jackson, was a man of the people, a man who epitomized the very essence of the American spirit. He stood for a sense of dogged determination, dedication to duty, and devotion to the bedrock principles of high courage, common intelligence, and individual integrity—principles on which this Nation was built.

President Harry S. Truman spoke often of freedom and challenged all freedom-loving people the world over to protect and preserve that freedom from the insidious encroachment of totalitarianism. All of mankind—the free and those who hope to be free—in this generation and for generations yet unborn—stand in debt to our great 33d President.

There can be no doubt that President Truman occupied a unique place in the hearts of the American people, and, in my estimation, he stands shoulder to shoulder with such great American Presidents as Jackson and Lincoln—men who left their own distinctive marks on the American Presidency.

The resemblance to Jackson is apparent in personality, in thinking, and in tactics. Both men fought hard and both men "gave 'em hell" out of a sublime dedication to the public interest. Jackson's struggle with predatory wealth and privilege, foreshadowed the dynamic Truman and the broad concepts of his Fair Deal.

The Truman likeness to Lincoln is for me the most arresting, because it is a

likeness in depth. Both men had an extraordinary impact on history, despite the fact that nothing in the past of either indicated the singular greatness they were to achieve. Both gave to the Presidency a special dimension of their own, a decisiveness and a dignity and in turn, the Presidency made them great. Both exercised an unerring and brilliant instinct for command. This was complete and unwavering, whether it involved giving drive and force to a Nation at war or cutting a great popular general down to size.

Yet, there is still a greater point of mutual identity—courage and a deep sense of devotion to the American democratic tradition. Lincoln and Truman have, as figures in history, what I can only describe as distinctly American personalities. This made them, even in their speech and manner, the very symbols of America, the embodiment of freedom and free men. Each was supreme in his hour on the stage of history. They breathed the will and the power, the conscience and the tradition of the American people, and spoke again and again as the American instruments of freedom.

I mourn and the Nation mourns this man of the people—this man from Independence, Mo., who spoke and gave international meaning and substance to this country's love of freedom and individual liberty. President Harry S. Truman walked with steady tread, and firm resolve. It is to his work as Chief Executive that the entire free world owes a profound debt of gratitude.

When Harry S. Truman was summoned to the White House from Capitol Hill on the night of Franklin D. Roosevelt's death, the Nation and the world wondered what type of man had suddenly assumed the regions of Government. Although Truman was no novice in the political arena, having served as a judge and a distinguished investigative Senator from Missouri, the Nation knew little about its new President. Consequently, the American people, anxiously awaited the administration of their new Chief Executive, shocked at the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and uncertain as to the future.

However, President Harry S. Truman seized the reigns of government with decisiveness and firm resolve. Relying upon the basic American attributes of courage, commonsense, and steadfastness, President Truman brought the American people through the last tumultuous months of the Second World War and launched the world on its infinitely long and hard march toward self-determination and freedom.

It was President Truman who decided to drop the atomic bomb, thus obviating the need for an American invasion of the Japanese mainland and thereby saving 500,000 American lives, and just as many, if not more, Japanese lives.

It was the Truman doctrine which shattered the long U.S. tradition of peacetime isolation by supporting Greece and Turkey against the Communist threat.

It was the Marshall plan, instituted by President Truman, which committed U.S. resources to the extremely success-

ful rebuilding of Europe, thereby saving Western civilization from communism.

Later President Truman defied the Soviet blockade of Berlin and risked war by authorizing the most massive airlift in history. The United States fed, fueled, and supplied a beleaguered city of 2.4 million by air for nearly a year.

Still later, it was President Truman who met the Communist invasion of South Korea by ordering U.S. Forces into the field and obtaining the help and support of the United States.

What looms large about these tough decisions, all made amidst bitter debate and uncertainty, was Harry Truman's courage—the courage to make tough decisions and to stand firm behind those decisions—a courage made even more impressive by the realization that the crucial problems and decisions he faced were perhaps more awesome than those hitherto faced by any other American President.

The American people could have chosen no greater leader in those harrowing years of international crisis than its humble, but decisive, servant from Missouri, Harry S. Truman.

Indeed, the death of our 33d President is more than just a national loss, for his death was profoundly noted by the entire free world.

No greater tribute could be recalled than that given by one of the world's giants, Winston Churchill.

It was in the closing months of Harry S. Truman's Presidency that Churchill said the following, with blunt honesty:

The last time you and I sat across a conference table in Potsdam, I must confess Sir, I held you in very low regard. I loathed you taking the place of Franklin Roosevelt. I misjudged you badly. Since that time, you more than any other man have saved Western Civilization.

Few will ever again doubt Harry S. Truman's greatness. Those who knew him and treasured his friendship will miss him, but his work and deeds will live for so long as our great American democracy shall stand.

President Truman's epitaph does not, I understand, include a favorite quote of his, but that quote sums up the essential greatness of the man. In his Presidential press conference of April 1952, he said:

I'll always quote an epitaph on a tombstone in a cemetery in Arizona: "There lies Jack Williams. He done his damndest."

SECURITY ASSISTANCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee (Mr. Morgan) communicated with the President concerning an effort by the Secretary of Defense to include the security assistance budget in the regular Defense Department budget.

As a member of the committee, I would like to support my chairman in his oppo-

sition to such a decision, which would have the effect of transferring the consideration of security assistance from the purview of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I concur with the chairman's feeling that security assistance programs are primarily an extension of the foreign policy of this Nation and therefore should be considered and evaluated by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Unfortunately, the Defense Secretary's request is really part of a pattern by which more and more programs wind up as part of the defense budget. This has restricted the proper Committees of the Congress from fully handling their policy-making work.

I applaud my chairman for his initiative in opposing such a change in policy and I hope that other members both of the committee and this body will join in supporting his position in this regard.

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great and good President of the United States, the late Harry S. Truman of Missouri.

I have had the privilege to serve under six Presidents. Each of our Presidents have had their own personalities and capabilities, and each will be accorded his respective place in the annals of history.

On April 12, 1945, President Roosevelt died. On that same day, Vice President Harry S. Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States. That was in my third year as Representative in the U.S. Congress.

During the ensuing 7 years, I worked closely with the President in achieving many of his legislative goals. I processed 41 Truman Presidential Reorganization Plans, as well as the bill which consolidated the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments into the one Department of Defense.

In August of 1949, the Soviet Union tested successfully their first atomic weapon. As chairman of an Atomic Energy Subcommittee, I directed a study of the feasibility of developing a far more powerful weapon, the hydrogen bomb. A national controversy arose, much of it directed against the development of the hydrogen weapon. The scientists were split on the issue.

Notwithstanding this opposition, the subcommittee and the full committee decided that we must protect the national security by developing this new weapon. Chairman Brian McMahon and I presented our affirmative recommendations to President Truman at the White House.

After less than 30 days of consideration between President Truman and his military advisers, the President accepted our recommendation and initiated the hydrogen bomb project. Its goal was suc-

cessfully achieved some 20 months later. President Truman's decision was proven wise, for within a period of 9 months thereafter, the Soviet Union tested successfully their hydrogen bomb. This decision was one among many decisions that President Truman made. I believe it was one of the most important because it assured the balance of military power between the free world and the Communist world.

Harry Truman's background was similar to millions of his fellow Americans. During the closing years of World War II and most of the years of that decade, time and events elevated him to the most important office in the world.

President Truman's ability to make important decisions when our Nation's values were challenged was based on his inherent commonsense, his courage, and his deep belief in our Constitution and the responsibilities of the office of the Presidency.

In my humble opinion, President Harry S. Truman's name will be inscribed on any list of the five greatest American Presidents and certainly he will be remembered with warm affection in the hearts of his countrymen.

H.R. 1414—TO REMOVE THE UNITED NATIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED STATES FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform our colleagues that I have reintroduced H.R. 1414 to repeal U.S. membership in the United Nations and any organ and specialized agency thereof.

I feel there is a growing mood in Congress, as the representatives of the American people, to recapture the prerogatives and powers which rightfully belong to Congress, the greatest legislative body of the world. I most emphatically support the basic constitutional concept of separation of powers so vitally necessary to true representation of the American people; however, I am satisfied that usurpation or erosion of the power of this Congress extends further than to the executive branch and includes the judicial branch as well as the quasi-international branch known as the United Nations.

Passage of H.R. 1414 would remove the United States from the United Nations and for all practical purposes would remove the United Nations from the United States, thus freeing the Congress and our people from the ever tightening yoke of international controls, while restoring full national sovereignty and constitutional powers to the Congress.

The mobilization for restoration of power to the Congress as a coequal branch, as intended by the Constitution, is good government, desired by all Americans. But, there can be no restoration of the proper balance of the powers

of government without a full distribution of the constitutional concept. This certainly must include restoration of rightful sovereign powers to the States and the return to the people and their local governments those powers of self-government never delegated to the federal system but rather which, as secured by the 10th amendment of the Bill of Rights, were expressly reserved to the people.

I feel that H.R. 1414 is basic in any move to restore the powers of government closer to the people, and it is for that reason I have reintroduced the bill and urge its support by all of our colleagues who are working to restore the powers of Congress and who believe in the right of the people to self-determination.

I insert the text of H.R. 1414, accompanied by a news release expressing the fears of former Ambassador Bush as to bloc voting in the United Nations.

H.R. 1414

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Revocation Act of 1973".

Sec. 2. (a) The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287-287e) is repealed.

(b) After the date of enactment of this Act, Congress may not appropriate any more funds for the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission, or other body thereof.

(c) Subsection (b) shall not apply to funds appropriated for the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission, or other body thereof only to facilitate the immediate departure of United States personnel and equipment from the United Nations, or from any such organ, specialized agency, commission, or body.

Sec. 3. The fifth paragraph of the first section of title I of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes", approved October 22, 1951 (65 Stat. 576), relating to contributions to international organizations, is amended by striking out everything after "\$30,297,861", and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

Sec. 4. The Act entitled "An Act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor", approved October 2, 1962 (22 U.S.C. 287g-287j), is amended—

(1) by inserting after "to the United Nations." in the first section the following: "No part of such \$100,000,000 shall be so loaned after the date of enactment of the United Nations Revocation Act of 1973.", and

(2) by inserting at the end of such Act the following new section:

"Sec. 7. Nothing in the United Nations Revocation Act of 1973 shall be construed to affect in any way the repayment of money to the United States under the loan agreement made with the United Nations by the President pursuant to the first section of this Act."

Sec. 5. The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor," approved July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 287m-287t), is repealed.

Sec. 6. Section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288) by amended by inserting after "means a public

international organization" the following: "(except for the United Nations or any organ or specialized agency thereof)".

Sec. 7. The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution authorizing a grant to defray a portion of the cost of expanding the United Nations headquarters to the United States", approved December 31, 1970 (84 Stat. 1867; 22 U.S.C. 287 note), is amended by striking out "expended" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the date of enactment of the United Nations Revocation Act of 1973".

Sec. 8. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2221-2224) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (b) and (c) and by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b) in section 301;

(2) by striking out subsections (d) and (e) in section 302; and

(3) by striking out section 304 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 304. EXCLUSION OF UNITED NATIONS.—After the date of enactment of the United Nations Revocation Act of 1973 no funds may be appropriated under this chapter to carry out any programs administered by the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission, or other body thereof."

[From the New York Times, December 23, 1972]

BUSH, LEAVING U.N. POST, IS FEARFUL OF BLOC VOTING

(By Robert Alden)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Dec. 22.—George Bush said today that he felt that the greatest danger to the United Nations lay in blind bloc voting and in the strident voices prevailing in those votes.

"What is increasingly happening," said the departing United States delegate, "is that the more moderate voices fear to speak out because they feel that they will appear less oriented or loyal to their group. So they keep their silence."

Mr. Bush spoke in a long interview as he prepared to leave here after two year's service to assume a new position as Republican National Chairman.

During the interview he spoke on a wide range of matters including the qualities that would best serve a United States representative, the future role of the United Nations in world affairs and the value of the United Nations as a window on the world for the United States.

TERRORISM ISSUE CITED

The problems posed by bloc voting, Mr. Bush said, were graphically demonstrated by what had happened when this session of the General Assembly considered an anti-terrorist resolution.

Although at the beginning of the debate it appeared that a considerable number of African nations were prepared to support strong international action aimed at preventing terrorism, by the end of the session, those he called the extremists dominated the bloc and won the vote for a resolution to study the causes of terrorism, which many in the West regarded as inadequate.

As an example of the members of a bloc fearing to speak up independently, Mr. Bush cited the candidacy of a Latin American diplomat for Secretary General last year.

"We confronted this man and told him we had reservations about his candidacy. The United States representative said. At the time no single Latin American voice was heard in opposition to him."

"Later, one after another of the Latin American countries came up to me and thanked me for voicing the objection they had been afraid to voice."

Similarly, Mr. Bush foresaw an increasing independence by the United States in its future voting here. This year, the United States exercised its veto in the Security Council on a Middle East issue and abstained in an

otherwise unanimous vote approving a committee to study a world disarmament conference.

"There was a time when all my predecessors had to do was raise an eyebrow and we had an instant majority," Mr. Bush said. "That isn't the case now. But my theory is that even if we are in a minority we have to be willing to stand up for what we believe."

Mr. Bush was asked what attributes were most important for a United States delegate.

"You have to like people," he replied. "You have to get along with people. You're dealing in essentially a political forum and you have to be able to maximize your position in votes."

"It's not a question of people liking you and therefore voting your way. It's much more complicated than that. But there is a certain amount of give-and-take, mostly on matters of amendments or timing—when to ask for something and when not to."

Mr. Bush believes strongly that there was a harmful overpromise of what the United Nations could accomplish in its early years.

"As a result of the accumulated agony of the war and the fact that we had a more universal organization than ever before he said, 'people felt that there would be an instant world government and instant peace everywhere.'"

"Well it just wasn't so, even though some people still feel that the U.N. should be capable for solving all problems everywhere. But that's not the case. We're a group of member states and if states don't agree—then it's just not going to happen here."

"There are a lot of problems we don't tackle because the member states don't want us to tackle them. So there's increasing frustration among people, who still believe in that original overpromise."

Mr. Bush foresees a brighter future for the United Nations and he leaves it with much hope. "I see the U.N. as becoming more important as time goes by, and as the Third World countries grow and mature and prosper. They will develop and have differing relationships and different alliances, and these will lend themselves to a stronger and more effective world organization."

For the United States, Mr. Bush believes that the United Nations' usefulness as a window on the world is worth vastly more than America's contribution to the United Nations' budget.

"From this place we have contact with everyone—friendly countries and other less friendly. We get to understand the aspiration of the small powers, Mr. Bush said. "When you can communicate with, and talk to, every country you get a profoundly different view of the world."

"The social life is important, too, although people often think of the continuing round of cocktail parties and dinners as wasteful. But no matter how sorely those parties tried my liver and no matter how dead tired I was, I would go out to those receptions so that, in an informal atmosphere, I could learn and understand better the aspirations of other countries."

"That sympathetic understanding is a very important part of the process of establishing a foreign policy," Mr. Bush said.

ROBERTO CLEMENTE

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, our world suffered an irreparable loss. On that day Roberto Clemente, a

man of stature and compassion, was killed when a plane bearing relief supplies for earthquake devastated Managua, Nicaragua, crashed. It was indicative of the greatness of this man that he volunteered to lead Puerto Rican relief efforts for Managua. Further, Roberto Clemente was not satisfied with being a symbolic leader and devoted long hours in planning and implementing the relief effort.

Students of baseball have sung the praise of Roberto Clemente's skill on the diamond, but the measure of the man is more clearly established in his multiple interests that were designed to aid the less fortunate. It was in this activity that his "machismo" were clearly demonstrated and his superiority exemplified.

I mourn with Roberto Clemente's friends and admirers. I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife and sons. However, I am confident that the spirit of generosity and concern bequeathed by Roberto Clemente will continue to act as an inspiration for people all over the world.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 20, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, each month I send to many individuals and organizations within my district a short newsletter called Washington News Notes, the January text of which follows for the information of our colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

JANUARY 1973.

WATCHDOG OF THE TREASURY

The National Associated Businessmen annually compile voting record tabulations of all Congressmen and Senators. The results show who voted for economy in government and who voted for excessive Federal spending.

The 1971-72 tabulations are in and, not surprisingly, only 25% of the Senators and less than 40% of the House members consistently voted for economy and fiscal responsibility. That select group received a miniature gold bulldog symbolic of the organization's "Watchdog of the Treasury" award.

Among the winners for '71-72, also not surprisingly, was Congressman Craig Hosmer, who has received the coveted bulldog 10 consecutive years since it was first presented.

AND YOU THINK YOU GOT TROUBLES

A Washington newspaper, in a lengthy story on the parking crunch in the District of Columbia, reported that many Federal employees go to extremes in order to find a parking space. Dozens of employees at the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare arrive at 4 or 5 a.m. to be assured of a parking space. They sleep or read in the cars until work begins at 9 o'clock.

Despite the parking problems, use of public transportation continues to decline. As ridership declines, fares go up and underused routes are discontinued, resulting in even fewer passengers. And fewer parking spaces.

DOES CONGRESS NEED REFORMING?

The most likely outcome of the forthcoming push for Congressional reform will be additional manpower and information systems to help the Legislative branch keep an

eye on the Executive. Liberals and conservatives agree that Congress relies too much on Administration manpower and computers for its information, and that its independent investigative sources must be expanded and approved.

However, many other so-called "reform" issues (seniority, more open committee meetings, age limit for chairmen, etc.) are merely ploys by Congressional liberals to overcome the more conservative majority, and are not likely to be adopted.

HOW SAFE IS SAFE?

For years, Congressman Craig Hosmer has been an outspoken advocate of nuclear power as a safe, clean alternative to fossil fuels for generating electricity. And in the face of the alarmists and doom-sayers, a UCLA engineering-medical team agrees. Nuclear power plants are far safer than oil-fired generators—10 times safer in fact.

An eight-month evaluation by 30 highly qualified and impartial authorities reached the conclusion that nuclear plants averaged less than one-tenth the risk of oil-fired plants in routine operation. Overall, the public health risk from either type was judged roughly comparable to such uncontrollable natural events as being struck by lightning or bitten by a snake.

INSTANT JUSTICE

One of President Nixon's principal anti-crime programs has been to speed up the judicial process in Washington. The new system, admittedly successful, reached a new height of efficiency recently when a 19-year-old D.C. youth was arrested, prosecuted, convicted and sentenced—all in 75 minutes.

Here's how it happened: the youth was in court for a hearing on probation violation. Frisking him, U.S. marshalls found narcotics paraphernalia. He was immediately taken before a judge, where he pleaded guilty and received a sentence to run concurrently with his previous indeterminate sentence.

BOOKS FOR YUGOSLAVIA

Books on such capitalistic topics as American business and economics will soon be winging their way to the Universities of Belgrade and Zebreb in Yugoslavia, thanks to the efforts of Cal State Long Beach Librarian Charles Boorkman with an assist from Congressman Hosmer, the Yugoslav Embassy and Yugoslav Air Transport. The books are surplus to the needs of Cal State and the Yugoslavs are anxious to bone up on American style free enterprise.

SS BENEFITS INCREASE—SO DOES CONFUSION

Those Social Security widow and widower benefit increases voted by Congress last October are showing up in January checks. But misunderstanding about the recent changes in the law have resulted in some disappointments.

While some reports indicated that all widows benefits would increase from 82.5% to 100% of the annuities to which their husbands were entitled, it is not as simple as that. How much the widow receives depends on both the amount to which her husband was entitled and the age at which she claims the benefits. She will get top dollar only if her husband was receiving or entitled to the maximum pension and if she waits until age 65 to claim it.

CONGRESS MUST BE FIRM

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Dispatch, a leading New Jersey newspaper, gave strong

editorial support to President Nixon's reelection campaign.

Even though they supported the President, they also felt that individual Congressmen—Democrats and Republicans alike—and candidates for the Congress ought to be reelected or elected on the basis of their records and their views on the issues of the day. Almost without exception, the people of northern New Jersey agreed with the Dispatch's editorial position.

On January 8, the editorial voice of this fine old newspaper sounded a note of caution concerning too large a grant of power to the executive branch of our Government.

The Dispatch has pointed out that—

Too long has Congress gone along with the President on Vietnam, too long have its members—supinely in most cases—allowed Mr. Nixon to do anything he wished. The time for definitive action is now.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the views of this newspaper and at the conclusion of my remarks I ask this editorial be printed in full.

I urge all Members—those on this side of the aisle as well as my good friends among the minority—to listen to what this fairminded independent newspaper has to say.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are alarmed about the imbalance that exists between legislative power and that of the executive branch. As I see it, there is a national feeling that Mr. Nixon has misread the election returns and has interpreted his landslide victory as something more than it is. In so doing, he would not be the first President to judge electoral victory as a call for executive dictatorship. And those Presidents have been Democrats as well as Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Mr. Nixon and the palace guard around him to ponder carefully upon the historic separation of powers which has always existed in this Nation. It is time for President Nixon to take Congress into his confidence. Ideally, we on the Democratic side of the aisle would like to be considered members of a coequal branch of Government. Is this asking too much? On the other hand, he certainly could show the members of his own party some consideration. Putting partisan considerations aside, the GOP side of this House and of the other body, too, contains a good many men and women of great intellectual ability, integrity and devotion to the national well-being. I am certain that these dedicated men and women can make a major contribution to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to agree on one issue: we are co-equals of the executive branch and we will insist upon our historic rights.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS MUST BE FIRM

The 93rd Congress which convened last week faces a major confrontation and it cannot evade its responsibilities to the people. It must decide whether it is going to continue to sit by and allow President Richard M. Nixon to stomp all over it in his conduct of the Vietnam war.

There has been an open defiance of Congressional power by Mr. Nixon in his stepping up the air war against Hanoi and it's about time to determine just what is what in

Washington. Does the Congress have the leadership to stand up to the President or doesn't it?

The people on Nov. 7 unquestionably gave Mr. Nixon a strong mandate, a vote of confidence, but a lot of that support was based on the point that he was apparently determined to bring to a swift conclusion the sorry and sordid mess in Indochina.

In the Hudson-Bergen area there was an extremely heavy outpouring of votes for Mr. Nixon but, significantly, at the same time people shifted when it came to the House of Representatives' contests and, in the ninth and 14th districts, reelected by solid margins two Democrats.

This was in the best tradition of the balancing of power between the executive and the legislative branch. People went for Mr. Nixon but they just didn't want to give him a Republican Congress. They trusted him but not quite that far and events have proved them right in their voting selectivity.

The new Congress has already demonstrated its determination to end the Vietnam conflict regardless of what the President wants to do. There is strong opposition to the renewal of the bombings and the Democrats in the House have left no doubt as to where they stand.

Not only is there this sentiment among the representatives but there is also a firming of opposition in the Senate and it is now amply evident that Congress is indeed demanding a swift end to the war. This is correct, for Congress must assert itself.

Too long has Congress gone along with the President on Vietnam, too long have its members—supinely in many cases—allowed Mr. Nixon to do practically anything that he wished. The time for talk is over; the time for definitive action is now.

The President must be put on firm notice that Congress and the people want the war concluded and the threat to cut off further funds for the Vietnam effort is one way to get the message across. There can be no backing down on this by our legislators in the capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL VETO ON CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in announcing the phase III wage and price control program last week, President Nixon called for voluntary cooperation in the continuing fight against inflation. The President observed that success of these voluntary policies will depend on a "firm spirit of self-restraint both within the Federal Government and among the general public."

Accordingly, I am reintroducing legislation today which is designed, in effect, to veto any further increases for Members of Congress, Senators, the Federal judiciary, and high executive officers.

Under this legislation, one Member of Congress could initiate action to force a vote on any pay raises for these officials. I do not believe such a vote, if taken, would be favorable, and I am well assured that many of my colleagues would join me in forcing the vote.

Under present law a Presidential commission has the power to study and propose revisions of the Federal pay structure. Such revisions automatically be-

come effective after 30 days unless at least one House of Congress specifically disapproves all or part of the recommendations. In the past, this has proved to be insufficient protection against unwarranted and unwise pay raises.

When the last congressional pay raise was recommended by the Commission in 1969, the Senate voted against disapproving the raise, but the House was given no opportunity to vote on the issue. The House Rules Committee refused to send the proposal to the floor for a vote. This took place just prior to the time the Congress recessed for Lincoln Day observance. I supported efforts that were made to not adjourn until the House had an opportunity to vote to reject the salary increase before the 30-day limitation ran out. I believe that if a recorded vote had been taken, the Members would have rejected the salary increase.

My bill would avoid this situation in the future. It would enable a single Member of Congress to require action on a pay raise resolution if the Commission recommends further increases. Any Member could file a privileged motion to take the resolution from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and bring it to a roll call vote if the committee did not act within 10 days.

As keeper of the Nation's purse strings, Congress has constitutional responsibility over its own pay scales and those of high judicial and Government officers. We never should have delegated this responsibility to a Presidential commission, and I voted against this action in October 1967. However, the Commission was established by a 12-vote margin.

There is no justification for further pay increases. We must now assume the constitutional responsibility of Congress by making certain that we will at least have the opportunity to vote on pay raise recommendations.

The President has called for voluntary action to hold wages and prices to non-inflationary levels. As elected representative of the people, we should set an early example of self-restraint. I urge prompt passage of this legislation.

MIZELL SEEKS REPEAL OF \$1 TAX CHECKOFF FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to reintroduce legislation I first proposed in December 1971, to repeal the \$1 tax checkoff plan for political contributions in presidential campaigns.

With the heat of last year's presidential election campaign having already cooled substantially, I am sure some of my colleagues may feel the dollar check-off issue has also died away.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that it is with this year's tax returns that this provision is

scheduled to take effect, and it is a matter of great urgency that we act on this legislation I have proposed at the earliest possible time.

As I said when I first introduced this legislation 14 months ago, the tax check-off provision represents a dangerous precedent and an invitation to possible political harassment.

The provision for political contributions and political identification on income tax returns opens the door for political harassment of the taxpayer.

It is my intention to close that door with this legislation.

The Founding Fathers, I am sure, would not have gone to such great pains to insure the right to a secret ballot if they had intended that a private citizen's political affiliation should be made a matter of record by including it on an income tax return.

We hear much talk today about individual rights being assaulted on every hand by an evermore imposing Federal Government, but it seems strange to me that some of the people who have done the most complaining on this issue stood up on the floor of the House and the Senate arguing in favor of this checkoff provision, which represents nothing less than a direct assault on the American citizen's political privacy.

Some reply to that by saying that the provision is only for a voluntary contribution, but there is no law to prevent a private citizen from making a voluntary contribution to the candidate or party of his choice right now.

The tax checkoff provision sets up an institutionalized mechanism that directly involves the Federal Government in a role it was never intended to play.

It is a dangerous precedent, and one that I do not intend to allow being set. I invite my colleagues to join me in seeking immediate passage of this legislation.

STATEMENT ON HARRY TRUMAN

HON. DOUGLAS W. OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 when I was 11 years old, I found my first national hero in the form of the tough-minded, fighting man from Missouri then facing an apparently impossible campaign. It was in that year that I made my first political commitment by writing on the sidewalks in chalk in my hometown of Panguitch, Utah, "Vote for Harry Truman."

In 1952 I traveled 250 miles for the opportunity for an introduction and brief conversation with President Truman. I found him gracious, yet awesome, and it has been my opportunity over the years to meet him on two other occasions and in that way, to touch as it were, contemporary world history.

He taught that politics was an honorable profession. He proved that a politician could be independent, strong, personally straight forward, yet also win

high office. I believe that history will judge him, after the 50 years' interim period he requested, as one of the greatest and strongest leaders of our time. At this point, 20 years past his departure from office, as a very amateur American politician, I place him among the all-time great American Presidents.

President Truman refused to be bullied about by political opponents at home or abroad and effected more than any other person, the reconstruction of Europe and saved them from external domination.

The name of Harry Truman will not be forgotten in the Owens' household,

just as it will live on in millions of homes where stories of unusual men are retold. My repertory of Harry Truman stories is extensive and illustrative of all that is good about the American political system. I am proud, indeed, of having been alive to watch the formation of the Truman heritage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 22, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.—Nahum 1: 7.

Dear Lord and Father of Mankind,
Forgive our foolish ways;
Recline us in our rightful minds
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence, praise.
Drop Thy still dews of quietness,
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace.

In all the discussions of these days and the decisions we will be called upon to make keep our minds clear, our motives clean, our hearts confident, our deeds constructive, and our consciences unashamed and unafraid.

God bless America. Stand beside her and guide her through the trying tribulations of these troubled times. And bless our astronauts as they open new doors of knowledge to us this day.

In the spirit of the Pioneer of Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement. The Chair is only going to recognize under the 1-minute rule a colleague to announce the death of a former distinguished Member. The Chair will, after the astronauts have appeared, take 1-minute speeches.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

TRIBUTE TO LEO ALLEN

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I take these minutes to inform my colleagues of the passing of former Congressman Leo Allen on Friday, January 19. His funeral will be held in the First Presbyterian Church, Galena, Ill., on tomorrow, January 23, 1973, at 11 a.m.

Leo Allen served 14 distinguished terms in the House of Representatives embellished particularly on two occasions by his service as chairman of the House Committee on Rules in the 80th and 83d Congresses. In the 28 years he served the residents of northwestern Illinois as their Representative to the Congress, he achieved a record of consistency and devotion to the principle of government in which he served.

I often had occasion to talk with him during those years after he left the Congress. He continued to remain deeply interested in the affairs of government and of the Republican Party. Leo's wife preceded him in death but he leaves five children, each of whom, I am sure, is imbued with the stamp of his strong personality, high character, and unblemished principles, a legacy matched only by Leo Allen's superlative record and significant place in the history of this body.

Leo Allen will long be remembered as a faithful legislator and outstanding American. Mrs. Anderson and I join Leo's thousands of friends in extending our condolences and deepest sympathy to the members of the Allen family.

I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the minority whip (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was saddened with the notice of the death of our former colleague, Leo Allen. He was a Member of Congress when I first came here, and I had the privilege of serving with him for 24 years. We became fast and warm friends during our tenure together in Congress. As a freshman Member here I often went to him for counsel and advice. I had the greatest respect and admiration for Leo. Truly he was a great American, a dedicated public servant, and one who contributed so much to this House during the time he was privileged to serve here.

I extend to his wonderful family my deepest and sincerest sympathy in this their time of bereavement.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues in the House in rising to pay tribute to an eminent Member of this Chamber, Leo Allen.

Though Leo came to Congress before I did, I had the distinct pleasure of serving with him on the Rules Committee following my assignment to that committee in 1955.

As chairman of the Rules Committee when the Republicans had control of the House during the 83d Congress, and later as ranking minority member of that committee, Leo Allen's great talents as a

legislator and parliamentarian came to the forefront.

As Representative of the 16th District of Illinois, Leo Allen consistently and vigorously fought for the philosophy and ideals in which he believed. In all ways, Leo served his constituency and his Nation with dedication and purpose.

Leo and I were friends socially as well as colleagues on Rules Committee. Both of us stayed at the University Club for a period. Leo was a very entertaining host and a thoroughly enjoyable person to be around.

I join my colleagues in their expression of bereavement. Mrs. O'Neill joins me in expressing our condolences to Leo Allen's family and friends.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to Leo Allen, one of the truly great Representatives which the people of the State of Illinois have sent to this body.

As a freshman Member, I benefited from the wise counsel and leadership that Leo Allen provided. I will long remember his sage advice and the principles of government and politics for which he so courageously stood. Those of us who remember him from his service here recognize that he was a champion of the taxpayer, a firm believer in the limitation of the powers of the Government, and a man who very effectively understood and served the people of his district.

Leo Allen was a great American and the kind of man that has made the House of Representatives the great institution that it is.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Leo E. Allen of Illinois.

It was my privilege to have known Leo as a friend for many years. Having worked closely with him during our joint service on the Committee on Rules, I knew him as a completely honest and forthright legislator, and a man deeply devoted to the best interest of the Nation. While we disagreed on a number of issues, I always yielded to his sincerity of purpose.

Leo served with distinction in the Army's field artillery in World War I. Shortly thereafter, he graduated from the University of Michigan. After teaching school for several years, he developed an interest in law and politics. Following completion of his legal studies, he was admitted to the bar in 1930, and began the practice of law in his hometown of Galena, Ill.

Prior to coming to Congress in 1933, Leo had twice been elected to the posi-